

1953

Box 2

IN THE COURT OF THE TRANSPORT TRIBUNAL

TRANSPORT ACT, 1947—PART V

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF THE
BRITISH TRANSPORT COMMISSION (1953 No. 134)

TO CONFIRM THE
BRITISH TRANSPORT COMMISSION
(PASSENGER) CHARGES
SCHEME, 1953

THURSDAY, 16TH APRIL, 1953

NINETEENTH DAY

Crown Copyright Reserved



PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE

To be purchased from

York House, Kingsway, LONDON, W.C.2 423 Oxford Street, LONDON, W.1
P.O. Box 569, LONDON, S.E.1
13a Castle Street, EDINBURGH, 2 1 St. Andrew's Crescent, CARDIFF
39 King Street, MANCHESTER, 2 Tower Lane, BRISTOL, 1
2 Edmund Street, BIRMINGHAM, 3 80 Chichester Street, BELFAST
or from any Bookseller
1953
Price 7s. 0d. net

00609227

PROCEEDINGS OF THE TRANSPORT TRIBUNAL

THURSDAY, 16th APRIL, 1953

PRESENT:

HUBERT HULL, Esq., C.B.E, (President)
A. E. SEWELL, Esq.
J. C. POOLE, Esq., C.B.E., M.C.

Mr. HAROLD I. WILLIS, Q.C., Mr. E. S. FAY, and Mr. KENNETH POTTER (instructed by Mr. M. H. B. Gilmour, Chief Legal Adviser to the British Transport Commission) appeared on behalf of the British Transport Commission.

Mr. H. V. LLOYD-JONES, Q.C., Mr. LEON MacLAREN, and Mr. GEORGE MERCER (instructed by Mr. J. G. Barr) appeared on behalf of the London County Council.

Mr. GEOFFREY LAWRENCE, Q.C., Mr. J. RAMSAY WILLIS and Mr. CHRISTOPHER HODSON and Mr. W. J. GLOVER (instructed by Sir Clifford Radcliffe, C.B.E., Solicitor and Clerk to the Middlesex County Council) appeared on behalf of the following County Councils: Middlesex, Berkshire, Buckinghamshire, East Sussex, Essex, Hertfordshire, Kent and Surrey.

Sir SHIRLEY WORTHINGTON-EVANS (instructed by Mr. Desmond Heap, Comptroller and City Solicitor) appeared on behalf of the Corporation of London.

Mr. J. RAMSAY WILLIS and Mr. W. J. GLOVER (instructed by Mr. W. O. Dodd, Deputy Town Clerk) appeared on behalf of Brighton Corporation.

Mr. LEON MacLAREN (instructed by Messrs. Blatchfords) appeared on behalf of the London Printing and Kindred Trades Federation.

Mr. G. R. ROUGIER (instructed by Mr. Archibald Glen, Town Clerk) appeared on behalf of Southend-on-Sea Corporation.

Mr. G. R. ROUGIER appeared on behalf of County Borough of Southend-on-Sea Railway Travellers' Association.

Mr. D. J. TURNER-SAMULES (instructed by Mr. W. H. Thompson) appeared on behalf of London Trades Council.

Mr. GEOFFREY RIPPON (instructed by Mr. R. H. Buckley, Town Clerk) appeared on behalf of East Ham County Borough Council.

Mr. GEOFFREY RIPPON (instructed by Mr. G. E. Smith, Town Clerk) appeared on behalf of West Ham County Borough Council.

Mr. GEOFFREY RIPPON (instructed by Mr. G. E. Smith, Town Clerk) appeared on behalf of South-West Essex Traffic Advisory Committee.

Mr. C. OSMOND TURNER (instructed by Messrs. Carpenter, Wilson & Smith) appeared on behalf of London Passengers' Association.

Mr. GERALD W. REYNOLDS represented London Federation of Trades Councils.

Miss DOROTHY D. FORSTER represented the Walthamstow Trades Council.

Mr. J. W. SYKES represented Edmonton Trades Council.

Mr. F. A. RULER represented the Federation of Residents' Associations in the County of Kent.

Mr. H. S. VIAN-SMITH represented The Association of British Chambers of Commerce.

Miss H. C. HART represented The National Association of Women Civil Servants.

Mr. N. J. LEWISOHN represented Whyteleafe & Kenley Residents' Association.

Mr. C. M. HAMILTON represented The Accountant-General's Department, Civil Service Clerical Association (Bickley Branch).

Mr. HYMAN FRANKEL represented The National Union of Bank Employees.

Mr. J. F. PLEYDELL represented Pitsea, Vange & District Resident Ratepayers' Association.

Mr. STANLEY MAYNE represented the Institution of Professional Civil Servants.

Mr. D. KELLY represented the South Essex Branch of the Communist Party.

Mr. J. E. MORRISH represented the Post Office Engineering Union.

Mr. J. REID represented the London North and London South District Committees of the Amalgamated Engineering Union.

Mr. ALEXANDER HALLIDAY represented the North London District of the Amalgamated Union of Operative Bakers, Confectioners and Allied Workers.

Mr. D. J. D. WELLUM represented the Benfleet & District Railway Travellers' Association.

Mr. S. M. NEUFELD represented the Students' Council, the Polytechnic, Regent Street.

Mr. J. MOSS represented the National Union of Furniture Trade Operatives (London District Committee).

Mr. E. A. HUNT represented the Association of Scientific Workers (London Area Committee).

Mr. W. TROTT, representing the Amalgamated Engineering Union, Deptford, No. 2 Branch.

Mr. A. A. DRIVER, representing the Students' Union of the London School of Economics.

Mr. JAMES ALFRED CORNELL recalled.

Cross-examined by Mr. FAY.

6637. Mr. Cornell, when we adjourned yesterday, Mr. Willis was asking you questions about your new exhibit L.C.C. 108. Have you that in front of you?—Yes. I have.

6638. The table on the left-hand side is headed Estimate of Urban Traffic Outside London. You gave a short description of what that heading meant yesterday. Would it be fair to say that what you are trying to get at in that side of the table is short-distance traffic in and out of large provincial centres?—Yes, I think that is a very fair description.

6639. It is the basis on which Mr. Valentine gave his answer upon which you base your line No. 1?—Yes.

6640. It might be instructive to look at Mr. Valentine's answer which is on page 146, Question 2216. It is the Eighth Day and it is on the right-hand column. The part of the answer which is relevant, I think you will agree, is on the right-hand column, about half-way down the page. Mr. Valentine says: "I cannot produce a corresponding statistic for the Provinces, because there is no means of getting it, but it is possible to say that, in the large provincial centres, after testing quite a large number of charges by a sampling method, about which Mr. Roberts could, if necessary, give further particulars, the provincial short-range cheap day traffic mainly travels at charges ranging from as low as 0.9d. per mile to about

16 April, 1953]

MR. JAMES ALFRED CORNELL

[Continued]

1.3d." He is referring, clearly, is he not, to short-range traffic from provincial centres?—Short-range cheap-day traffic, yes.

6641. While we have this answer before us, it is instructive to go on and deal with the 10 per cent you have adopted. Mr. Valentine continues: "That does not cover all the traffic, because some of it, probably somewhere a little above 10 per cent, on the average, is travelling at 1.175d. per mile because it has not got a cheap fare available to it". That was your base, Mr. Cornell, as I understand it, for your figures in line 1?—Yes, that is correct.

6642. Let me ask you this. Your percentages in column 4 in that table are money percentages, are they not?—Yes, they are percentages.

6643. Represented by the money figures in column 3?—It is money in column 3, yes.

6644. Money percentages?—Yes.

6645. When you put down that figure of 10 per cent, I take it that you assumed—when Mr. Valentine gave the figure of 10 per cent—he was giving a money percentage?—Yes, I did.

6646. Perhaps you will take it from Mr. Valentine, through me, Mr. Cornell, that he was not thinking of the money but of the passenger journeys, when he gave that 10 per cent.

(President): It is clear, is it not, because he is talking about traffic net receipts?

6647. (Mr. Fay): That is the interpretation I should have put upon it, but apparently there is scope for misunderstanding. He does speak of traffic, does he not, Mr. Cornell?—Yes, he does speak of traffic.

6648. And, to put it at its highest in your favour, it is ambiguous; traffic means people—I looked at this answer very carefully, trying to find some measure. The best measure I could find was this 10 per cent.

6649. Now you know that the 10 per cent was people and not the money they paid, your figure of 10 per cent in column 4 may be quite wrong, may it not?

(President): Well, it cannot be quite right.

6650. (Mr. Fay): The people who are 10 per cent, of the whole are paying 1.3d., whereas the other 90 per cent are paying something in the region of 1d., so 10 per cent of passengers pay 1.6d. per cent, if my arithmetic is right. —1.6d. per cent, instead of the 10 per cent. Well, it is perfectly obvious that it would be a greater figure than 10 per cent.

6651. Perhaps you would check it, and if it does not come out something about 16½ per cent, you could correct it later. If it is 16½ per cent, and not 10 per cent, that throws out all your other percentages, does it not?—It reduces them all.

6652. It renders them all inaccurate?—Yes, if it were 16½ per cent, it would take roughly ½ off each of these. It would be about 21½ per cent, without working it out.

6653. Let me go on to your succeeding line, No. 2, where you have given accurately the figure of £3.4m. as being the receipts from ordinary cheap day returns. It is clear, is it not, from the letters read yesterday that they are the whole of the ordinary cheap day returns outside London?—Yes, the whole.

6654. So it includes cheap day returns between small provincial centres?—If there are such returns, yes.

6655. And it includes cheap-day returns between country stations?—If there are such returns, yes.

6656. Well, you know there are, do you not?—As a matter of fact, no.

6657. Well, perhaps you would accept it that there are?—Yes, I am bound to, because I do not know.

6658. (President): Mr. Cornell, did you compose the whole of this table, including the description at the top left-hand side?—I am responsible for that, yes.

6659. What led you to call this traffic "Urban Traffic" if you did not know whether or not there were cheap-day returns between places which were not urban?—The impression gained from the evidence of Mr. Roberts, where he talks about these fares and experimental cheap fares being in and out of urban areas. Could I find the reference?

6660. I thought you had just told us that you did not know whether or not there were ordinary cheap-day returns between centres which were not urban?—That is so, Sir. The information we gathered as to cheap fares is all information on cheap fares which have an origin in a provincial centre. I have no information as to cheap fares between very small country towns. There may be some—I do not know.

6661. You assumed that there were no such cheap-day fares?—I have assumed there were no such cheap-day fares.

6662. (Mr. Fay): Let us come to the next line. That is your experimental cheap-day returns.—Yes.

6663. Which you have rightly stated at £3.4m.—Yes.

6664. That again is the whole of the country outside London?—Yes.

6665. And there again, I suppose, you were under the impression that these experimental fares all worked into or out of some large provincial centre?—Well, yes, I did, but surely that is right? On Mr. Roberts' answer to Question 4808—that is the 14th Day, page 290.

6666. When he said the experimental fares were in operation in about 130 of the larger towns of the country?—The figure may be very slightly exceeded now, but not substantially in numbers.

6667. You can take it as being something like 130 to 150 of the principal towns.—Yes.

6668. Perhaps you did not appreciate that when, based on a town, an experimental set of fares is put into operation, it not only includes journeys to and from the terminus in the town but intermediate journeys as well, along the line where the fares are in operation?—Yes.

6669. You appreciated that?—Yes.

6670. With that appreciation in mind, will you look at your previous table, 106, where you set out some of these experimental fares, page 186 of the transcript?—Yes.

6671. In your third column, Mr. Cornell, you have the fares which, in fact, operate on the line between Nottingham and Worksop, have you not?—In the fifth column.

6672. The stations on the line are given in your column 3.—Yes.

6673. Column 3 contains a number of stations on the line, does it not?—Yes.

6674. And you have given the fares from Nottingham to those stations, have you not?—Yes.

6675. You appreciate those fares—similar cheap fares are in operation between any two stations on that line, do you?—Yes.

6676. For example, you can go from Kirby-in-Ashfield to Mansfield Woodhouse on an experimental fare?—Yes, I expect you could.

6677. That would be a country journey, would it not?

(President): We must be careful, because in the eyes of some people the designation "urban" may be a title of honour, and one does not want to offend Mansfield Woodhouse by suggesting it is not an urban area!

(Mr. Fay): I should not have thought it ranked among the 150 principal towns, Sir!

(President): Does he consider the journey between Mansfield Woodhouse and Shirebrook (West) is urban traffic?

(Mr. Fay): You have heard the question, Mr. Cornell, do you consider that would be an urban journey?

6678. (President): I expect he has not the faintest notion—I know one of these stations, Sir, but not the other.

6679. (Mr. Fay): With what knowledge you have of the district—and you seem to know one place—is it not clear that you can take a journey on that line between a pair of stations which is not an urban district?—Yes, I think that is fair. Suburban might be said of one of them perhaps.

(Mr. Poole): That could be made to apply to London Lines too.

(Mr. Fay): Yes, to some extent, Sir.

16 April, 1953]

MR. JAMES ALFRED CORNELL

[Continued]

(President): The whole purpose I gather is to draw conclusions from the provincial side as suggesting that in similar circumstances in the London area the same experiments should be tried. Is that it Mr. MacLaren?

(Mr. MacLaren): Broadly yes, Sir. And if I may make it quite clear, I am afraid I was under a misapprehension about the ordinary cheap-day fares, and no doubt Mr. Cornell was too. It is based, as I understand it, on these 130 main urban centres for a radius of not more than 30 miles. That is so near the London area geographically—and that area does, in fact, contain several substantially large towns. It seemed to us to be a parallel.

(President): I think, at the moment, my disposition is to regard the adjective "urban" as a little bit over-concise.

(Mr. MacLaren): Certainly, Sir.

6680. (Mr. Fay): And Mr. Cornell, you are including in lines 2 and 3 journeys which clearly were not in Mr. Valentine's mind when he gave the figure of 10 per cent., are you not?—Such journeys as?

6681. What I have called the country journeys. Well, perhaps that is a matter for argument. May I pass on to your line 4—Early Morning Returns £3.5m., which you took from B.T.C. 601, line 14. Have you that table in front of you?—Yes.

6682. You have simply taken the figures in line 14 in that table, have you not?—Yes.

6683. It is £3,473,000, and you have properly rounded it up to £3.5m.—Yes.

6684. You appreciate that you have a lot of traffic in and out of London in that figure do you not?—Yes, I think I said so in answer to Mr. MacLaren yesterday, but I cannot take it out.

6685. You took it out of your next line—line 5, Season Tickets?—Yes, because we had there some basis on which to take it out.

6686. If you look at line 15 of B.T.C. 601, you see Season Tickets taken on the same basis as you have taken Early Morning Returns, coming to £4.9m., as against £3.2m. which you have taken—that is right, is it not?—Yes, it shows £4.9m., and £3.2m. on my document.

6687. That shows that the journeys into and out of the London area on season tickets are very considerable, does it not?—Yes.

6688. Have you any reason to suppose that a smaller proportion does not affect early morning returns?—I should have thought early morning returns would be much smaller in proportion because of the limitation of time. People who travel on early morning returns have to be at the terminal point at eight o'clock. They can hardly—it is unlikely they would be travelling such long distances as those with season tickets.

6689. You are envisaging them travelling all the way into the London Terminus, are you?—Yes, I was, in that answer.

6690. Of course, you know that there are a number of industrial towns along the periphery of the London area—such as Slough, for example, and Watford? A person travelling from Reading to Slough counts as an outside-London traveller for the purposes of Table 601, does he not?—Reading is outside.

6691. Reading is outside the London area, and Slough is inside?—Yes, it would be as you say.

6692. There is obviously a very considerable element into and out of London in these early morning figures of yours?—There must be. I have made no attempt to discount that.

6693. The result is rather a hodge-podge, is it not?—It is indeed.

6694. The season tickets include all the long-distance season tickets, for example?—Yes, that is the whole figure.

6695. Including all the people who buy expensive season tickets such as from Manchester to Edinburgh?—The whole season ticket receipts are the basis of it.

6696. To arrive at a true comparison you would have to make alterations not only to the 10 per cent. in line 1, but also to the figures in all the other lines, would you not—with the possible exception of 2 and 3?—Yes.

6697. There is another matter on the table—towards the foot of the table you have set out the receipts from day return fares, and from experimental day return fares in different years. They do not purport to be anything more than plain figures of receipts?—No more than a memorandum of that information derived from the references.

6698. You are not seeking to suggest that is all new traffic, for example?—No, it is just for record purposes.

6699. And quite obviously a lot of your travel at cheap fares had previously travelled at ordinary fares. How much, I am not asking you to guess?—No, I do not remember it ever being given. I remember evidence that some of it would be new.

6700. The object of putting on the cheap fares is to attract new traffic, is it not?—Yes.

6701. And the old traffic goes at the new cheap fare, does it not?—Yes.

6702. That is all I want to make on that table. There are just two other questions I must put to you. Your Table L.C.C. 106 was mentioned yesterday. That is the table at page 186, giving experimental fares from Nottingham?—Yes.

6703. And it was mentioned yesterday, I think, that there were one or two errors in it?—In line 25.

6704. In line 25 the mileage should be 24, not 28?—Yes. I am not yet happy about the 24.

6705. That is what I am instructed the mileage is for charging purposes, and no doubt for geographical purposes too?—Mr. Roberts said that the rate per mile was 0.77—that does not tie exactly with 24 miles. That is the only difficulty there.

6706. I am not seeking to take you through all the slight errors in this table. There are, in point of fact, I am told, three other mileages which are slightly wrong?—That may well be. We took them from Bradshaw.

6707. The Railway calculation appears to be a mile different from Bradshaw in three other cases. The other point I want to ask you about on this table is this. In your column 7 you give—calculated no doubt by the mileage—what are described as Proposed Early-morning Fares. You see that?—The figures are taken from B.T.C. 506.

6708. They are the full rate early morning fares for the mileage?—The figures shown in that column, yes.

6709. And you have not attempted to find out what the actual fares will be when you pay attention to any sub-standard element?—No, that is just taken from that column.

6710. Perhaps you will accept it from me that on some of these journeys there is a sub-standard element, so that it would be in practice, for the proposed scale, that they would not pay quite as much as you show in that column?—I have no doubt that some of these are sub-standard.

6711. Line 4, for example, you have got down, quite rightly, 1s. 2d. as the proposed early morning fare for 6 miles, but the person making a journey to Bulwell will pay 1s., because it is a sub-standard fare. You could not be expected to have calculated all the sub-standards.—Yes.

6712. There are, of course, a number of other sub-standards.

(President): This is only a scale.

6713. (Mr. Fay): I appreciate that, but I did not want anyone to think it gave factual information. Yesterday, Mr. Cornell, we were referring to your table 103, which gave the weighted average cost per mile in London, and my learned friend, Mr. Willis, gave to the Tribunal some figures which included the sub-standard element. Do you recollect that?—Yes, I do.

6714. There is only one point I want to make further to the Tribunal upon that, and it is this. Our figures take into account all sub-standard elements, that is to say not only the sub-standard element inherent in the old reduced fare—the kind which went up last year and came down again—but also the sub-standard element introduced by reason of some sub-fare-stages being longer by half-a-mile or a mile. There are many instances where the bus passengers travel more than a mile for 2d., owing to the situation of the traffic junctions.—Yes, I felt sure when the figures were given to me that they included sub-standards,

16 April, 1953]

MR. JAMES ALFRED CORNELL

[Continued]

because the rate for 1s. 4d. struck me as being rather longer than what I would have thought at first glance.

6715. That sub-standard element, both on road and rail, owing to the passenger getting rather more mileage than he would strictly be entitled to on scale, would also be included.

(*Mr. Poole*): There are probably also instances where the passenger would travel less than he would be entitled to do.

Re-examined by MR. MACLAREN.

6716. If I might ask you first to turn to L.C.C. 108, Mr. Cornell?—Yes.

6717. We have been told that on the left-hand side of the table the first percentage should be about 16 per cent., and we have been told that the lines, 2, 4 and 5 contain fares which do not centre upon provincial urban centres. Very shortly, Mr. Cornell, if the sums of money in lines 2, 4 and 5 are reduced, that, of course, will reduce your total and will re-act back on the first line. That is right, is it not? Whatever the 16 per cent. may be it will be reduced by the reduction in the total?—Yes, the figures will have an automatic reaction on the percentages.

6718. And the effect of reducing lines 2, 4 and 5 will have the effect, of course, of increasing the percentages at line 3, will it not?—Yes, clearly.

(*President*): The percentage in line 3?

6719. (*Mr. MacLaren*): Yes, Sir. And, of course, it is line 3 which shows the percentage of travel round urban centres that is at a very cheap fare?—Extremely cheap day returns are at a very cheap fare—below 1d. a mile. Perhaps I should not say below 1d. a mile, because the answer to question 4824 was about 0.7d. to just over 1d. a mile average. Shall I find the question?

6720. If you please.—It is the Fourteenth Day, page 290, Question 4824.

6721. Yes, the question was, "What is the range of rate on those tickets?" Mr. Roberts replied: "It is about 0.7d. to just over 1d. a mile, very rarely falling below 0.8d. or 0.9d. There are exceptional cases where you get the odd very low rate, but generally speaking they do not drop much below 0.8d. or 0.9d. per mile." That is the answer to which you refer, is it?—Yes.

6722. And those are fares covered by line 3 of your table, of course?—Extremely cheap day returns.

6723. You were given figures in substitution for those figures of yours in L.C.C. 103. I just want to ask you one thing about this. First of all, the calculations you made assumed that everyone travelling was travelling at the standard rate?—Yes.

6724. And, of course, if the Scheme is approved without any limitation on increases, or when the limitation on increases ceases to have effect, these would be the fares which the Commission would be entitled to charge in London. Is that not right?—After limitation.

6725. So if the limitation does not take effect or ceases to take effect, this is the kind of charge per mile which the Commission would be entitled to make in the London area.

(*Mr. Fay*): Mr. MacLaren, are you suggesting that the Transport Commission are going to alter their fare stages, because if this suggestion is followed out it takes into account the second of my sub-standard elements—namely fare stages, and, of course, there is no intention of altering that.

6726. (*Mr. MacLaren*): I am grateful to my friend for the expression of no intention of altering fare stages. That will assist in some way. But may I draw your attention, Mr. Cornell, to the Tenth Day of the Record, at page 168; you see at Question 2463 on page 168 I am asking Mr. Valentine about the revenue he gained from increasing sub-standard fares to the full standard. I asked, "Have you any figures for the fares to which these increases would apply to the revenue gained from these fares?" He answered, "I do not think we could do that. You are really asking, I take it, what is the present revenue from fares which are sub-standard?" Answer, "Yes". He goes on, "We might be able to make some sort of an estimate of it". "Mr. Valentine, I should be grateful if you could assist me on this." Answer, "I do not think

(*Mr. Fay*): Yes, but those also are included. But it is not included where a passenger gets on and pays 2d. on a bus and then gets off after a hundred yards.

(*Mr. Poole*): I see—where he gets off between fare stages.

(*Mr. Fay*): The fare stages are dealt with, and I am instructed that the pluses outnumber the minuses. Thank you, Mr. Cornell.

Re-examined by MR. MACLAREN.

we could possibly do so on road services. We did do that at one time—right back before 1950—and I think gained some information on it for the 1950 hearing in relation to railways. It did not produce a very reliable and accurate set of figures, but it has been done to that extent, to find what proportion of revenue has been derived from standard fares and what from sub-standard. I believe it was a very laborious calculation which we did for the 1950 hearing and there was an exhibit about it in that hearing." The answer continued in that fashion. Mr. Valentine was telling me there that he was not able to calculate the sub-standard element in his base on road services.—Yes.

Thank you, Mr. Cornell.

6727. (*President*): Mr. Cornell, would you take your Table 107, the bottom of the table is expressing the population of the area described as Greater London in terms of households, is it not?—Yes.

6728. Have you got the First Census volume before you there, or perhaps you carry the figures in your head?—No, Sir.

(*Mr. MacLaren*): I will have him provided with one.

6729. (*President*): Mr. Cornell, will you look at page 9. I am anxious as we have a statistician in the box, to make quite certain that I understand some figures. Have you got page 9?—Yes.

6730. On the lower part of that page you get the population of Greater London—is that not right?—This is a table of ages by marital condition.

6731. Will you look at the bottom, where this time we deal with the conurbation. The first is Greater London. Am I right in supposing that the first figure at the top of the second column, 8,344,000 is the population of Greater London?—Yes, the population of Greater London.

6732. I do not want you to do the arithmetic here, but would you, after you have left the box, tell Mr. MacLaren whether I am right in these figures as to the age of that population? My arithmetic brings me to the conclusion that 2,650,000 out of that total figure of 8,344,000 are either under fourteen or over sixty-five.—Yes, very well.

6733. Would you do this arithmetic for me and tell Mr. MacLaren whether that is right? I did not want to ask him to do it. Perhaps you would also check this figure—that out of that same total population of 8,344,000, 2,002,400 are under fourteen or over seventy-five.—Under fourteen.

6734. Yes, but I also want the figure over seventy-five. Now the last question I would like your help on is, first of all—is this the only volume which has been published of the Census results? I know this is the first.—There is a second part.

6735. Dealing with the composition of families?—Yes.

6736. Can I then—I take it that you are familiar with all the pages in the first volume?—No.

6737. —can I extract anywhere any figures as to the number of employed persons in the Greater London Area? There again, do not go through the whole of the volume for me—I should have thought so, from the part marked "Industries". But could I look at that and let you know later?

6738. Would you? And perhaps you could tell Mr. MacLaren and he will tell me.—The number of employed persons?

6739. Yes—where it will be found in this volume; how many of the 8,344,000 people in Greater London are to be regarded as employed persons, in any sense of the word.—Not including housewives?

(*President*): No.

(*Mr. MacLaren*): That completes my evidence, Sir.

(*The Witness withdrew*.)

16 April, 1953]

[Continued]

(President): Mr. Turner-Samuels, you did put in a table. Can you tell me on which day?

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): It is on the 15th Day.

(President): L.T.C. 1.

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): May I first mention the course I hope to take. I shall not be calling evidence, but I shall be referring to a number of official statistics, copies of which I have here in the relevant Gazettes, but if you should feel on any point that I have gone further than I should on the statistics, I should be happy to call evidence. However, I feel it will not be necessary to do that to substantiate what I feel is a very strong case.

I appear for the London Trades Council. I want to make it clear in opening that I do not suggest that there should be any different treatment for London than for any other part of the country. We are not opposing the rest of the country to London, but we do say that what happens in London is of the greatest importance to the rest of the country.

So far as the Scheme itself is concerned, my case in a nutshell is that the increases being asked for are unjustified and unfair. In approaching the problems I ask you to bear in mind that it will be clear from what I say that this is not the last fares increase which the public will be asked to bear. It is not as though a matter is being settled for the last time. Sir Reginald himself admitted that in the Scheme that is before you there is no headroom in the increases of the price of coal which has already taken place.

The Scheme is opposed on four general grounds. I think it would be clearer if I mentioned the four grounds, and then went into them in detail in turn. The first is that the British Transport Commission has not made out a case on its accounts for any increase in revenue from London. The second ground is that the Scheme will not achieve the yield expected from it; it is based upon false premises; the third ground is that the proposed increases for those who used to travel by workmen's tickets and who now travel either by early morning singles or early morning returns is unjustified and excessive, and that this class of traveller has been singled out for specially onerous treatment. The fourth ground is that under the Scheme put forward by the British Transport Commission the Commission will not be carrying out their duties to the public under the Transport Act.

On the first ground that no increase is necessary from merely looking at the accounts, I put this first, not because it is my case that it is the most important matter with which you have to deal, but in order to dispose of it first. I have a certain suspicion of accountants, and when one is dealing with an increase yield demanded which is less than 1 per cent of the gross revenue of the British Transport Commission, the accountants have to be looked at very carefully to see if by some slight alteration it is not possible to deal with what is for the Commission a small sum in the accounts. However, on this I would like to adopt the words of Mr. Justice Harman, which head the current edition of Current Law Notes. He said: "Accountants are the witch doctors of the Modern World, and they too are apt to deal in unrealities".

(President): What is the reference for that judicial pronouncement?

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): 1953, Vol. 3, Current Law Reports.

(President): I meant in the Law Report, or perhaps it was at the Law Students Dinner!

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): I do not know, but I adopted it, as I thought it put it rather more nicely than I possibly could. I suggest the realities in this matter lie outside the accounts and are the economic situation, travel trends, and, above all, the narrowing margin of spending.

Therefore, I come to my second major point, that the Scheme will not use the increases suggested. To put that in a nutshell, my argument is that the British Transport Commission is killing the goose that lays the golden eggs; that experience has shown that they are driving Londoners off their transport system; and I think I will be able to establish clearly that they are deliberately refusing to face the facts as to why this is happening. They will not recognise why travel in London is becoming less; they

will not recognise the effect of fares increases. Their estimated yields are all based upon assumption that the travel trends will remain the same as they were in the last quarter of 1952. That assumption fails to take into consideration first the economic situation and the narrowing margin of spending, and secondly what is already happening to travel.

May I deal first with the economic situation and the amount of money that people have in their pockets. It is right first, I think, under this head to say that travel in London is an increasingly large and important item of expenditure for the ordinary person. You will recall that there has been evidence before you that in the years 1938 and 1939 Londoners spent £4.3 per head on travel; in the year 1949 they spent £7.6 per head on travel; and under this Scheme they will be spending £9.2 per head on travel. That means that the increase since 1939 is over 100 per cent.

(Mr. Poole): You have not related that, Mr. Turner-Samuels, to the form of percentage of spendable income? These are the actual figures?

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): No; £9.2 is more than 100 per cent of £4.3.

(President): Exactly, they are spending £9.2 per head. It does not take into account any possible increase in income that the spender might have had.

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): I do not desire at the moment to deal with that point. I think, with very great respect, that it comes more naturally later on. I want at this stage just to show that travel was an important item for London. Of course, there are many Londoners who do not travel, and these average figures are based on the very aged, who may not be able to travel, and the very young, who probably do not want to travel and do not travel.

(President): Not based upon, but included in the divisor.

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): That is so. Again, to set out the sort of expenditures, the average expenditures there are on travel in London, you will recollect that the London Travel Survey showed that the medium worker spent 3s. 9d. per week on travel to work, and the average worker spent 4s. 10d. per week. That, of course, was in 1947. It is shown at the very back, as far as I recollect.

(President): You mean the last table.

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): Page 37 and page 36. Since then there has been an average increase in fares, according to the evidence of 26 per cent, so dealing solely on averages (the unsatisfactory nature of which, of course, I fully recognise) the equivalent figures to-day would be 4s. 10d. for the medium worker and 6s. 0d. for the average worker per week. As I shall show, in fact early morning fares have gone up much more than 26 per cent. They have gone up in fact by about 100 per cent, since the Survey was taken. I mention that I recognise the unsatisfactory nature of these average statistics, and you will recollect that on the last occasion when a Draft Scheme was being considered by this Tribunal I called evidence on behalf of my clients to show the very large sums that many London workers had to pay weekly upon travel.

I think it is clear as a matter of common sense that the effect on travel, the degree of the effect on travel of any reduction in the margin of spending of ordinary people depends on just how much that margin is reducing and may reduce. I have on this point a wealth of the most varied evidence to assist me. First, I think if one looks at the figures for National Assistance one can get some idea. Unfortunately these statistics evidently take some time to prepare, and the latest one is for the year ending the 31st December, 1951. I think it will be convenient to start with 1951 because you will see, Sir, how the situation has altered in other respects since then.

(President): Of course, Mr. Turner-Samuels, you are not here representing the workers of London, are you? You are representing a number of persons who either directly, or because some body of which they are a member is affiliated, had a link with your clients.

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): I put it like this, Sir: I am here representing the London Trades Council, an organisation which has affiliated to it, upon the latest figures, approximately 350,000 persons who are Trade Unionists in London.

16 April, 1953]

[Continued]

(President): But are you going to tell us anything special about that 350,000, or are you going to ask us to act upon the footing that those 350,000 may be taken as an average sample of the population?

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): I am asking you to take it upon the footing that they are an average sample of the Trade Unionists in London. I am opposing the Scheme on behalf of those Trade Unionists on the ground, amongst others, that the basis upon which the British Transport Commission have estimated their yield from this Scheme is inaccurate.

(President): That will enable you to talk about the population in general.

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): Yes. The table in Appendix I on page 28 of the Report of the National Assistance Board Report, for the year ended the 31st December, 1951, shows that the number of cases current at the end of the months I shall mention were: July, 1948, 0.48m.—

(President): Are you looking at 28?

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): Yes, of the National Assistance Board Report. 0.84m.; July, 1949, 1.09m.; July, 1950, 1.25m.; July, 1951, 1.39m.; and December, 1951, 1.46m. A steady and unfortunate increase.

I can assist you further by figures which will show you what is happening in relation to national savings. These are published in the Economist's records and statistics from the Exchequer returns. I am sorry that I have had difficulty in getting extra copies of these, so if I may just read from these copies: the Exchequer returns show that for the 51 weeks ending on 22nd March, 1952, the total amount invested in national savings increased by £6.14m.

(President): That is both certificates and bonds. I suppose.

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): That is certificates and bonds, and Post Office and Trustee Savings Banks. That for the 51 weeks ending 21st March, 1953, there had been a reduction in national savings of more than £25.68m.

(President): Those are net savings? That is to say, after withdrawals.

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): That takes into account the interest on certificates repaid, and the interest approved. So the net savings, of course, are a much higher figure. That shows that over the past year there has been a substantial dipping into savings.

There is another example of this dipping into savings. The Economist's records and statistics also show that the Co-operative Societies' share capital is down, although membership is up. In 1949 the membership of the Co-operative Societies was 10.25m., and their share capital was £237.12m. In 1950, the membership had increased to 10.52m., but the share capital had reduced to £230.33m. By 1951, the last figure that I have available, the membership had shown a further increase to 10.74m., yet the share capital had again reduced, this time to £222.15m.

Of great interest and, I suggest, importance on this aspect of the matter is the Government's Economic Survey for 1953. If you would be good enough to look at page 21, table 15, at the head of that page, shows what has happened to personal consumption in the last few years. That shows that based upon 1948 market prices there has been a total reduction in personal consumption in 1951, as against 1950, of £13m. a year; and in 1952, as against 1950, of £107m. a year.

(President): That is based on 1948 market prices?

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): That is based on 1948 market prices.

(President): And it also shows an increase in 1952, based on 1948 prices, of just under 194m.—an increase over 1948.

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): Yes; the trend is upwards in 1948, 1949 and 1950, the point I wish to make is that since 1950 there has been not a steady decrease, but a quickening decrease. If you would look at Table 16, the food consumption in the United Kingdom, that shows that in 1950 less total energy value of food was consumed than in 1949; less still in 1951; and still less upon the provisional figures—the only ones available—in 1952.

(President): Are you now passing from the Economic Survey?

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): I shall be referring to it again.

(President): Before we get very far from the National Assistance Report for 1951—the report, not the Economic Survey—turn to page 5 at the top; apparently applications for assistance in 1951—applications not recipients—was about 3 per cent. less than in 1950. That would indicate the number of those who needed, or thought they needed, assistance was less; fewer people formed the opinion in 1951 that they were in need of assistance than had formed that opinion in 1950.

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): Yes, but the amount of assistance required was much more substantial, and the numbers involved, even although there was some slight reduction, are still very large.

(President): Not the amount required, but the number of cases which were current is the figure you were giving us in the appendix to 28.

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): Those presumably would be the number of people who were actually receiving it. There may have been more applications that were refused in one year than another, and so on. But the number of people who have actually been in receipt has been steadily increasing.

(President): Yes.

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): The next figures I want to mention have been given to me from Hansard, and they show the milk consumption over the past four years. In 1949, 1,513.8m. gallons of milk were consumed. In 1950 this figure was increased to 1,557.2m. gallons. There was a further increase in 1951 to 1,572.9m. gallons. But last year there was a decrease to 1,546.1m. In order to show that is not due to a reduction in milk production—

(President): I do not think you need show that.

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): I am obliged; I was going to refer to the economic survey. There has in fact been an increase.

The Ministry of Labour Gazette for March of this year, at page 94, shows the number unemployed. The table is headed "Numbers Unemployed, 1939-1953". I shall refer to the total for Great Britain, and not to the United Kingdom, because that includes Northern Ireland. This table shows that in 1950 the total unemployed was 314,000.

(President): The annual average.

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): Yes. In 1951 the annual average had reduced to 252,000. In 1952, the annual average was up to 414,000. But on the 8th December, 1952, the number of unemployed was 399,000. On the 12th January, the number was 452,000, and on the 16th February, it was 428,000.

(President): Those figures always include, of course, people who are temporarily unemployed. Those are the figures on the registers, are they not?

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): Those include the wholly unemployed and those who are temporarily stopped. But I think it would be right to say that so far as transport statistics are concerned, and the number of people who travel, I do not think it would really matter whether a man was off work because his job had ceased for a week or fortnight, or because he has been off longer. Though of course the economic effect of being off work longer is very much greater, and that would carry certain greater weight.

(Mr. J. C. Poole): When you pick out a particular date, Mr. Turner-Samuels, you really ought to compare it with a similar date in the previous year, because of the seasonal element.

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): Unfortunately the figures I have got here do not show the unemployed for the relevant months in 1952, but only at a later stage.

(Mr. J. C. Poole): You see my point.

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): I see the point, yes; but compared with 1950, 1952, for example, over the whole year, shows a substantial increase.

(Mr. J. C. Poole): When you were referring to a specific month, as a figure, it should be related to the same specific month of the previous year, I think, to give it its real value.

16 April, 1953]

[Continued]

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): By the adjournment I will try and get those figures for you.

(*President*): It should be observed, on the top of the column, on the left-hand side of that same page, that in the London and South Eastern areas, the figures on the register in the middle of February were better than the figures or the numbers on the register in the middle of January.

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): I think the total figures showed that I mentioned the 12th of January figures, and the 16th of February figure, and those showed there had been a reduction in unemployment.

(*President*): Perhaps not attributable to the introduction of the hearings of this scheme.

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): Nor would they, I suggest, be attributable to the slight reduction of fares as a result of the Government intervention.

(*President*): That is some time ago now.

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): Yes, Sir. Perhaps there is another interesting figure one can look at, that is cinema admissions.

(*President*): Are those counted as well?

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): Yes: the Board of Trade seems to be indefatigable. The Board of Trade Journal for the 28th February of this year, page 413, shows the summary of admissions and takings. Table 4, the London and South Eastern areas: the admissions for the third quarter of 1951 were 68.66m., and for the third quarter of 1952, 66.1m.

(*Mr. A. E. Sewell*): Does it give the takings for those two periods?

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): Yes it does. The net takings for 1951 were £4.04m., and for 1952, £4.01m., there having been an increase in admission prices over the whole of Great Britain. In fact there was a reduction of admissions for the third quarter for 1951; the total figure for Great Britain was 34.8m., and in the same quarter of 1952 the admissions were 33.52m. Over the whole of Britain, although those prices had been increased, box office takings in fact fell.

(*Mr. J. C. Poole*): Mr. Turner-Samuels, if my family is anything to go on, the introduction, very much against my will, of a television set into my home has had a most marked effect on the attendance at cinemas by my children. I do not know whether that applies elsewhere.

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): That may well apply. I do not think it is possible to argue on any single statistic what has happened. But I hope that from those I am giving I will build up a picture from which it is possible to say, from the whole, although one may be due to one thing or another, nevertheless, it shows a decline in this, that and the other. In other words, a decline in the marginal spending. That is how I put these figures forward.

During the past year, there has been a substantial increase in the price of food, which of course will again eat into people's pockets. The latest figures that I have available are those in the Ministry of Labour Gazette for 14th March, which I think is one that is already before you. Page 106, the left-hand column, you will see that the cost of food was 100 on the 15th January, 1952, when there was a new table introduced, and that on 17th February, 1953, it had become 109.6. A 9.6 increase in one year and one month.

(*President*): Clothing and household goods had gone down.

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): Clothing had gone down. Fuel and light was up. Household goods down, and everything else up. The cost of living itself had gone up 4.7 per cent.

I think assistance can be given from what is happening in the retail trade. Perhaps I could adopt this passage from the Economist's records and statistics. On 7th March, 1953, page 169, when they say, "The retail trade in food and perishables in 1952 was dominated by the substantial advance in prices resulting from the policy of reducing food subsidies. Large retailers' money sales of food and perishables together rose from 1951 to 1952 by about 12 per cent." Since the average level of retail food prices in 1952 was some 16 per cent. higher than in 1951, there must have been an appreciable fall in the volume of food and perishables sold.

If, at this point, I may come to the table that has been put in L.T.C. 1.

(*President*): You have got your food consumption figures from that table in the Economic Survey, did you not?

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): Yes. From the figures there.

(*President*): Pre-war, 1949, 1951 and 1952. Apparently more fresh meat and bacon was eaten in 1952.

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): Some things had gone up.

(*President*): And less sugar, fats and cheese.

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): Those two items must depend to a large extent on the ration. It is the overall figure which, in my submission, is the important one. The London Trade Council Exhibit is based upon actual earnings and retail food prices, and retail prices for all items, which are those given in the Monthly Digest of Statistics produced by the Board of Trade. Often it is said that one cannot rely upon the figures relating to wage levels, because what really matters is earnings. Here, I have been fortunate enough to be able to place before you statistics which relate to actual average weekly earnings.

(*Mr. Fay*): Sir, if my friend is going to deal with figures in this table, I think I ought to inform you that we have checked them and found they contain arithmetical errors. Not of any large proportion, but quite a large number of figures which we have calculated come up at different decimal points, or in some cases a different whole number, from those given in the table. The most significant of the corrections as we see them, Sir, is under the heading of "Retail Prices of Food"; for the last figure which in the table is 124.6, our arithmetic yields the figure of 130.1. Also in the last line under the column, "Earnings", the figure of 118.2, as we see it, should be 118.7. There are, as I say, a number of other errors as we think them to be.

(*President*): We really must not have a dispute on the multiplication table. These are all taken from the Ministry of Labour Gazette.

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): They are all based on official figures. I would be happy to accept the two figures which my learned friend has mentioned. I am sorry that this had not been mentioned earlier, or no doubt we could have agreed.

If I may base my submission upon my figures—or I could possibly leave this matter after the adjournment.

(*President*): It is a pity there should be any dispute on this. I do not know if they are sufficiently competent arithmeticians to put it right before lunch-time.

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): I will come back to that, because I do not want to dispute anything of that nature at all.

(*President*): I do not suppose it will affect your argument at all.

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): The figures seem to be substantially accurate to a decimal point, except in one case where they are in my favour.

Having shown you what is happening so far as trade, food purchases, national assistance and so on, is concerned, I would like to deal, for a moment, with travel trends. Particularly with travel trend in London on Sundays, because in my submission this in particular shows the way the Commission have been burying their heads in the sand. Mr. Valentine, in dealing with what he himself called this big decline, gave as the reasons the increase in the number of private cars, which he said, although he put it first, "was nevertheless the lesser reason". Secondly, the increase in the working of the five-day week. In my submission, whilst both those items are, to a limited extent of course, factors, the real factor is the smaller margin of spending, and increased fares. An address by Mr. Menzler was put before you, and at table 30 of that address, "The passenger journeys on Sundays in 1951, as compared with 1938-39, had increased by 13 per cent., as against a 19 per cent. increase in the case of Mondays to Fridays, and 16 per cent. increase on Saturdays".

Some other figures were put before you, Sir, earlier figures produced by Mr. Menzler, and those showed that in 1948 the increase in Sunday travel was 22 per cent., as against a 17 per cent. increase on Saturdays, and a 21 per cent. increase on the other days of the week. Upon the evidence, the 1948 substantial increase in Sunday

16 April, 1953]

[Continued]

travel was after the major change over to the five-day week. The major decrease in Sunday travel has taken place between the years 1948 and 1951 on the figures which I have quoted to you.

What I call the excuse of the five-day week was first put forward by the Commission in their 1949 report, page 117, paragraph 386. There they said that "In 1949 passenger takings showed a proportionately greater decline on Saturdays and Sundays than on the other days of the week. Journeys to and from work form a high proportion of all travel on Mondays to Fridays, and on these days takings were only fractionally below the level of 1948. Passenger traffic at weekends, which has altered in character since before the war as a result of changes in travel habits, associated particularly with the widespread introduction of the five-day week, is much influenced by the weather." Then they go on, "The decline in weekend travel, which was more marked in the early months of the year was substantially arrested by exceptionally fine weather throughout the summer". And they refer to the number of tourists and so on.

In 1950, however, after further decreases, which could then not well be related to the change over to the five-day week, the British Transport Commission got somewhat nearer the truth in paragraph 506 of page 157. There they said, "As in 1949, the decrease in traffic on the London Transport system in 1950 was due in the main to a continuing decline in optional travel. The greatest decline was in Sunday traffic which is predominately of an optional character. The decrease on Saturdays, when there is also a high proportion of travel for amusement and recreation, was somewhat greater than on Mondays to Fridays, when travel is for the most part for work and other essential purposes. The continued fall in optional travel reflects the reduction of expenditure on less essential purchases and services, including transport for pleasure. Increased supplies of goods have become available and the substantial rise in the volume of retail sales in the London area has tended to absorb purchasing power which might otherwise have been expended on recreation and amusement, including travel for these purposes. The evidence is that a larger part of the smaller marginal income available is now being spent on goods rather than on services, including optional travel." In other words, the decline is due to a change in spending habits, or the amount of money one has to spend, and by that time it is apparent, of course, that it is nothing to do with the five-day week. When I say nothing, I mean substantially nothing to do with the five-day week.

Furthermore, there has been a further drop in 1951 in all travel. The deterioration on Sundays, therefore, has been after the years during which the main changes to the five-day week have occurred.

What the Sunday travel statistics show in my submission is that higher fares coupled with a smaller margin for personal expenditure means less for what the British Transport Commission calls optional travel. I think this failure on their part correctly to understand the causes of the drop in travel, and what is happening upon the system, is a matter of the greatest importance.

There is also evidence, which I just throw in at this stage, of the drop in passenger traffic on the British Transport Commission generally, and there is what is happening to the early morning return travel, which is reducing in London—I shall deal with the exact statistics later—and on British Railways, too, as their tables show: 4.3m. people are being driven off their early morning facilities, and their seasonal traffic will fall by 2.3m.

Against that, there is the slight evidence, but I think to some extent you may feel it is valuable evidence, of what happened after the Government intervention in October. The effect of the Government intervention was that there was a small decrease in fares for certain traffic. After the decrease in fares the transport statistics levelled out, and the decline became very much less.

It would perhaps be convenient to refer to the table put in by the County Council, CC/H. 405 at this stage.

(President): That is one of their original tables, is it?

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): It is one of their original tables. I do not think there is any alteration to this one at all. Page 14 of the original bundle of exhibits. The last column, 11, shows that after the fares increase early in the year, for the London Transport Executive, there was a steady decrease in the number of passenger journeys

originating as compared with the previous year. In the fourth period after the increases became effective, there was a decrease, for example, of 6.3 per cent., the next month 5 per cent., the next month 7 per cent. But a decrease which one can quantify, roughly, just looking at the thing, as about 6.5 per cent. Then there was the Government intervention, and in the four-week period 11, the percentage decrease dropped to 3.4.

(President): I do not quite follow this. What Government intervention, and in what month? What is the 11th period?

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): The 11th four-week period.

(President): That would take you somewhere to about the end of October, would it not?

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): It was about the beginning of October, I think I am right. Perhaps the Commission can assist?

(President): One had better be a little exact.

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): It is twelve weeks before the end of the year.

(President): The Government intervention happened much earlier than that.

(Mr. A. E. Sewell): 1st September, I think it was.

(President): The final arrangement is what you mean as a result.

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): As a result, yes.

(President): Was that not at the beginning of September? There need not be any doubt about this.

Mr. Poole says that the situation which now exists, that is to say the fare stages were put back to their original form, some standards became operative again, was on 1st September.

(Mr. Fay): That is right. While I am on my feet, may I call attention to the fact that the comparison in column 11, to which my friend is referring, is, of course, a comparison with a year which included the Festival traffic during the summer months.

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): It may be that even that decrease did not save the situation for them at all. You will recollect that the estimated yields, the estimated travel in one year, was based upon the argument that travel would be about the same as at the end of 1952, and at that period there had been a levelling out of the decline, if there is anything in their argument, that levelling out comes immediately after what is, in effect, a decrease in fares.

Having shown the reduction in the margin of spending, and having shown in my submission that it affects the British Transport Commission's statistics, and the number of people who travel, the next question that naturally follows is, what amount of travel is vulnerable to be influenced by the diminishing margin of spending? Is a high percentage of travel open to effect or not? It is, perhaps, convenient to divide travel into two types, as has been done hitherto, that is what is called compulsory travel, and what is called optional travel. Compulsory travel, which largely must be travel to and from work, is not so vulnerable to the fares level as other travel, because people have to get to and from work. But, in my submission, it would be quite wrong to suggest that people will not endeavour to either walk further, to get more direct journeys, or to alter their place of work, or to buy bicycles, or these bicycles with motor assistance, or take some method of escaping the fares increase. In addition, of course, compulsory travel is vulnerable to the level of employment and to overtime, because if overtime is not worked on Saturdays there will not be a compulsory journey on that day. The other category of travel, of optional travel, that is travel for shopping, for education, for sport, for entertainment, for recreation, forms a considerable part of the London Transport Executive customers, and obviously is likely to be affected particularly by any increase at all in fare levels. Assistance can be given here by the London Travel Survey. Table 6 on page 19 shows that all persons making regular journeys make regular journeys as to 50 per cent. of their travel for work; that means that it is 50 per cent. also not for work. As much as 25 per cent., for example, is for shopping, and 26 per cent. for theatres or cinemas.

16 April, 1953]

[Continued]

(President): 23 per cent. is for "Others". I take it that is not for work, school, shopping, theatre or cinema, or sport.

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): Other than any of those items.

(President): That sounds to me probably to be for the fun of travelling.

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): I do not know whether recreation; perhaps it is, for example, going out to the country for a day. It shows particularly the high percentage of women who use the transport system for other than work journeys. Therefore there is in fact 50 per cent. of travel on the London Travel System which is of an optional or semi-optional character, and which is open to particular effect from any increase in fares.

(President): More strictly of the regular travel.

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): Of the regular travel, yes.

(Mr. Fay): I think my friend has misunderstood the table. The 50 per cent. for work includes partly some of the people who make the other journeys. That is demonstrated by the fact that the figure adds up to 138 in the total column and not to 100. This is what is stated in the title: "Proportion of people making regular journeys for". Some people may make a regular journey for work and a regular journey for sport; they would be the same people.

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): I think my learned friend has misunderstood what I was saying. I said that 50 per cent. of all persons use it for work. They may also use it for something else than going to work. That means that 50 per cent. make journeys which are not for work at all. Even that latter 50 per cent. may be for several purposes on the one journey, but none of it is for work.

(Mr. Sewell): For instance, the person who goes to work and stays in town in the evening to attend a theatre comes into two columns.

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): Yes, but if he takes one journey and he goes shopping on the way to work, that one journey will come under the work heading. I have excluded all those double or treble, or whatever they may be, journeys which are related at all to work. As you can see, of all the journeys which are at all to do with work are in the first column. The percentage is 50, and that must mean that 50 per cent. have nothing at all to do with work.

Whilst we are on that table, another figure to which I would like to draw your attention is the high percentage of those of the age of 65 and over who use London Transport for shopping journeys regularly and for other journeys regularly. You will see that the other journeys column includes, for example, visiting relatives and that sort of thing.

I have mentioned the importance of shopping journeys which is apparent from this table, and I would like next to show what has been happening to shopping.

(President): Do you mean by that what has been happening in the shops?

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): I think it will be clearer as I go through the table which appears on page 501.

(Mr. Fay): Of what?

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): Page 501 of the Board of Trade Journal, Vol. 164, of the 14th March, 1953. You will see that that table shows "Percentage changes in values of sales and of stocks compared with a year earlier—large retailers". It deals with weekly sales in January of this year, and it shows what has been happening in various parts of the country. The ones to which I wish to draw your attention are those headed "London-Central and West End" and "London-Suburban". That shows that for non-food merchandise there has been a reduction in what I may call West End shopping as compared with the previous year of 5 per cent., whereas the reduction in London-Suburban shopping is only 2 per cent. For food and perishable merchandise there has been an increase in the West End of only 9 per cent., whereas in the London suburbs there has been an increase of 14 per cent.

(President): They are not sales only, are they?—Are the figures you have been giving not stocks as well?

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): They are shown separately; below the areas the weekly sales are shown. These are the amounts of the sales in pounds, shillings and pence reduced

to a percentage. It shows that the overall position is that there has been a reduction in the January, 1953, figures as compared with the previous years of 1 per cent. In sales, whilst there has been an increase in the suburbs of 10 per cent. Of course, sales have gone up because of increased prices, which this table reflects. This table shows, therefore, that people are no longer going to the West End from the suburbs to do their shopping as they were doing formerly.

(President): Why does it show that?

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): If they are showing they are not doing their shopping—

(President): Does it show they are going at all in either of these periods? Does it show that the sales in London-Central and in the West End have altered, and, if so, how does it show that those sales in either of the two periods compared are sales of people travelling to London-Central and the West End from other places.

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): I think it shows it in this way: West End sales have gone down; Suburban sales have gone up substantially. If nobody in the suburbs went into the West End to shop, one would not expect the habits of those who do live in Central and West London to have substantially altered as compared with those living in the suburbs.

(President): It rests upon the assumption that the habits are the same, and presumably the margin of spending will be the same for those who live in London-West End and London-Central.

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): It is based also, I think I can say, on the fact that the large stores to which these tables relate—Selfridge's and so on—cater not solely for those living in London-Central and West End, but for those coming in from the Provinces.

(President): What is London-Central and West End?

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): The precise area I do not know, but I think one can give a rough guess that it is what one would call normally the West End and the City.

(President): I do not know where the West End begins or ends.

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): Whilst one does not know the exact street where it begins or ends, I think one has a very good rough picture of where it begins and ends.

(President): I have not. I think this is one of the matters you say we ought to take into account—the changes evidenced by this table.

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): That is how I put it forward, but I will submit that there can be drawn an inference that people are shopping more in the London suburbs, and knowing the types of shops there are in the West End, one would be justified in drawing the inference that means people are no longer coming from the suburbs to the West End to shop to the same extent.

(Mr. Poole): That is not undesirable, is it?

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): I dare say the shops in the West End will say it is undesirable.

(Mr. Poole): I am not thinking in terms of the shops; after all, they can always move. I meant this quite seriously, in general.

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): So far as my clients are concerned, it is undesirable, because it is desirable that they should be able to shop where they find the best selection or the lowest prices. I am not saying that the best selection or the lowest prices are necessarily to be found in the West End, but I think they ought to be given the opportunity of making such choice as they desire. In my submission these figures show that over the past year they have had to cut down on their choice, and in my submission they will have to cut down still further if there is any increase in fares. That is a bad thing, as far as they are concerned, and it is a bad thing so far as the Transport Commission is concerned, because it is going to affect their estimates of the yields for which they are so hopefully waiting from this Scheme.

(President): It seems to me a very, very slight element of hardship that they should have to buy bread near their homes rather than to travel to Bond Street, or wherever bread is to be found in the West End, and that they should be restricted in the shops to which they can go

16 April, 1953]

[Continued]

to buy ribbons. It may be troublesome, but it is not the sort of thing which one could regard as a major calamity.

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): It is troublesome not to have a choice, and the tables show that the lack of choice seems to hit people more in food and perishables than in other goods. It is not so much the irksomeness as not being able to buy what you want in the way of food, and, if I may say so, I think probably people will not complain so much about not being able to buy bread at the lowest prices as they will complain with regard to certain other commodities. It is a hardship that people cannot buy things at the cheapest current price. The degree of hardship, of course, I have to leave in your hands to calculate.

(*President*): Are you suggesting that the cheapest current price is more likely to be found in the West End and Central London than in what you have described as the suburban areas?

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): There is no evidence to show that or to show the contrary.

(*President*): You are asking us to draw an affirmative conclusion of some sort. If there is not any evidence, we shall not be able to draw it.

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): I am asking you to draw the inference that if one is able to travel to some of the great London markets, for example, as well as to some of the large London stores, one is more likely to get the things one wants and more able to find the cheapest articles of the kind one wants.

(*President*): You are not making any impression on at least two members of the Tribunal on that point.

(*Mr. Sewell*): On three members.

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): Different people look at these things in a different way.

(*Mr. Sewell*): I know my wife has travelled to the West End stores to look for something, and then has gone home and bought what she has wanted next door.

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): Some wives are depriving themselves of that pleasure. I am sure that appears, because many wives when they roam through the stores buy the odd things that they would not otherwise do, and that is reflected in the drop in spending.

The third ground for opposition to this Scheme is, as you recollect, that the increases which will have to be borne by those who formerly had workmen's tickets is unjust, unwarranted and disproportionate.

I have prepared a table which is abstracted, except in one matter, from evidence that has been given either before you on this occasion or from the Exhibit "A V/5" on the first of these hearings. It sets out the workmen's fares and early morning return fares for pre-war, 1950, 1952, and under the present Draft Scheme. I think it would be convenient if this was before you. Whether you desire it to be an exhibit, if I may, I will leave it in your hands.

(*President*): It is inconveniently late; but your remedy, if we do not allow you to hand it in, will be to recite a long list of figures, I take it.

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): Yes. You will see, Sir, that columns 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 are abstracted directly from what was Exhibit AV/5.

(*President*): I will take it from you for the moment. I shall not see it, and AV/5 is not a document which remains permanently impressed upon my mind.

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): I assure that it is so.

(*President*): 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 are taken from AV/5?

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): Yes.

(*President*): Very well.

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): The other columns are abstracted from the relevant sources, and in fact I think most of it was gone through by me in evidence given by Mr. Valentine, as was column 11. I have added column 12, which is pure mathematics, and I trust accurate mathematics, on my part.

(*President*): You may use it, Mr. Turner-Samuels. You proceed on the assumption that the figures are right. I will not decide at the moment whether they need be printed until I see how important they are.

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): The importance of these figures is, in my submission, that they show the absolutely disproportionate increase in the fact that early morning workmen have to pay. Column 11 shows that at 2 miles the user of these tickets now has to pay 133 per cent. more than before the war; at 3 miles, 200 per cent.; 4 miles, 175 per cent.; 5 miles, 140 per cent.; at 6 miles, 133 per cent.; at 7 miles, 128 per cent.; at 8 miles, 112 per cent.; 9 miles, 111 per cent.; and at 10 miles, 100 per cent. Perhaps even more revealing is the final column 12, which shows how great has been the percentage increase and the additional burden put upon these travellers since 1950, because the increase in just about 2 years has been for those who travel 2 miles, 100 per cent.; for those who travel 3 miles, 122 per cent.; 4 miles, 80 per cent.; 5, 6 and 7 miles, 100 per cent.; 8 miles, 88 per cent.; 9 miles, 111 per cent.; and 10 miles, 81 per cent.

(*Mr. Poole*): Mr. Turner-Samuels, do those increases include the increase made on, was it not, the 1st October, 1950?

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): Yes.

(*Mr. Poole*): It is a little indefinite here. You simply use the 1950.

(*President*): It is pre the first Scheme.

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): Before the first Scheme came into effect, yes. The comparative increases borne by ordinary fares are very much less. For example, at the 2 mile level, whereas the increase since before the war paid by the person who had the workmen's tickets is 133 per cent., the ordinary fare increase is only 75 per cent. At 3 miles, whereas the increase for the workmen is 200 per cent., for the ordinary fare it is only 75 per cent. At 4 miles for workmen it is 175 per cent.; for the ordinary fare it is 75 per cent.

(*President*): You mean the ordinary fare in London, of course?

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): Yes, in London.

(*President*): Outside London you get a different picture.

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): Yes; I am dealing with in London.

(*President*): Ordinary fares outside London, prewar, compared with now would give you quite a different picture, would they not?

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): Yes, they would. I am dealing with how it affects the Londoner. So one sees, Sir, the totally disproportionate increase on the workmen's category of fare. And this of course is deliberate policy on the part of the British Transport Commission, and they acknowledge it as such.

(*Adjourned for a short time*.)

(*President*): Mr. Turner-Samuels, this document will be printed as L.T.C. 2.

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): I am much obliged, Sir.

I have been asked what the unemployed figures were in the equivalent records of last year to those that I gave for this year. The monthly Digest of Statistics for January, which I have with me, shows that in Great Britain the total unemployed on the 14th January, 1952, was 378.7 thousand and on the 11th February was 393.5 thousand. These figures are both slightly lower than the figures in the same records of this year.

I have also, during the adjournment, had a look at the figures of the British Transport Commission, which they say are the correct figures that ought to be in my L.T.C. 1. In all cases it is a decimal point difference—in all material cases, except for the retail prices of food in April and October of 1952. In both those cases the British Transport Commission figure is higher, being for April 124.8 and for October 130.1. I am afraid I have not been able to check this during the adjournment, but I do not think that in any event my argument is affected by, in the first case, the decimal points, and secondly by a suggested error which would, in this case, be in favour of the Commission.

What the table L.T.C. 1 does show you is that men's earnings have lagged behind the increase in prices, whether it be on an average of all items or of food prices, but particularly behind food prices. And it also shows that women's earnings have lagged behind even further. There was one stage—the early part of 1951, when, in fact, earnings had caught up, or even overtaken, the percentage

16 April, 1953]

[Continued]

increase for a period in retail food prices and, indeed, retail prices of all items. But since then the position has deteriorated and the gap is, in fact, increasing, so that men's earnings in October 1952 (which is the last figure available) are, to leave out the decimal point, 118, and women's earnings 116; retail food prices on the British Transport Commission figures, 130 and retail prices of all items 120. That further elucidates the point I was making earlier as to the reduced margin of spending.

When you rose, Sir, I was dealing with the disproportionate increases on early morning travel.

(*Mr. Fay*): If my friend is coming to his table L.T.C. 2, which I understand you have now ordered to be printed, Sir, might I draw attention to the fact that three of his percentages appear to be wrong.

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): Which three?

(*Mr. Fay*): The first three in column 12. The first percentage is given as 110, which is the comparison, as I understand it, of 7d. in column 10.

(*President*): It is given as 100 in my copy.

(*Mr. Fay*): It is a comparison of 7d. in column 10 with 4d. in column 6—an increase of 75 per cent., 3d. on 4d. If I rightly understand what is being compared with what, I think that must be so.

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): In this case column 12 compares the 1950 rail—

(*Mr. Fay*): London Transport Rail.

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): Yes, London Transport Rail with the proposed increase. I think my learned friend is right. The three-penny fares have been taken—the road fares.

(*Mr. Fay*): The 100 should be 75, the 122 should be 125, and the third which is down to 80 should be 120.

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): I see where the error has been made. It is entirely my fault. The twelfth column is a comparison with the first 1950 figure, road excusing coaches. That is where it has gone wrong. I have the one I made my calculations on here. I am sorry about that.

(*Mr. Fay*): Perhaps Mr. Turner-Samuels will see that the shorthand-writer has a corrected copy for printing.

(*President*): Would it not be simpler for Mr. Turner-Samuels to print it without column 12, and leave it to someone else to work out, if you want to make a comparison between rail figures. The heading of the two columns suggests that the comparisons are with regard to rail fares, and unfortunately in some of your figures in column 12 you are comparing the 1950 figures with the rail figure, the 1950 figure being a road fare.

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): It would make the table correct if, instead of London Transport rail, it was amended to London Transport road, because, before the war, road figures—from a quick glance at them—seem to be the same.

(*President*): Perhaps you had better just reconsider this, and it can be put into the transcript tomorrow rather than today. We will not put it in to-day, so will you see that we have a revised table to-morrow?

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): Yes, I am sorry for that. Sir. Coming now to the gross yield from early morning travel, under the 1951 application the figures put in by the British Transport Commission show that the early morning passengers were 11.6 of the whole and yet they were asked to pay 17.6 of the increased yield.

(*President*): You mean the early morning passengers were 11.6 of the passenger journeys originating?

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): Yes, including the back journey. Similarly B.T.C. 502 and 510 show that the early morning return passengers to-day are 9.38 per cent. of the whole, and yet they are being asked to pay 23 per cent. of the increased yield. These disproportionate yields are based, as I understand it, upon some reasoning of the Commission that everybody should pay the same amount for travelling the same distance, irrespective of the times at which they travel. There are, of course, a number of answers to this argument, the first being what is being done in practice by the Commission. And it is clear from the Commission's own table that the early morning travellers are being singled out for disproportionate increases, as compared with the season ticket

travellers. In the 1951 application the season ticket yield was to be increased by 20 per cent., according to B.T.C. 217 (a), whereas the early morning return travellers were to pay an increased yield of 26.7 per cent. And in the present application before you, Sir, season tickets are anticipated to yield a further 3.8 per cent., whereas the early morning travellers are anticipated to yield a further 12.4 per cent. So that those who used to have workingmen's tickets and now have early morning returns (or early morning singles) have had their fares raised disproportionately, compared with another form of cheap travel.

Now, of course, the Commission have declared, as a matter of policy, that it is their desire to abolish completely workingmen's tickets, early morning returns or early morning singles, and, in my submission, the present Scheme is a step in that direction, although Mr. Valentine, in his cross-examination denies it. And he put down any lessening in the percentage gap between early morning returns and ordinary fares as difficulties of coinage, as dealt with in Question 3285 on page 205. That answer will not stand up to examination, in my submission. If the British Transport Commission were concerned only with maintaining the present relationship between the ordinary fares and the early morning fares, the two-mile fare ought to be 6d.

(*President*): You mean it ought to remain what it is?

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): Yes, because the equivalent ordinary fare has had no increase whatsoever. And by my calculation, if they were concerned to keep the relationship of the two types the same, and were not trying deliberately to close the gap, the three-mile fare should be 8d.

(*President*): Again, should remain what it is.

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): It should remain what it is. That bears a closer relationship to the present position than the fare suggested by the Commission, and from the evidence of what they are in fact doing it is clear that they are closing the gap, and if you accept Mr. Valentine's evidence that that is not what they want to do, then, Sir, you will not accept the proposed increases in early morning returns.

(*Mr. Poole*): Mr. Turner-Samuels, are you really supporting Mr. Morrish's proposal on page 113?

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): I put my case like this, Sir. I oppose any increase in early morning fares at all. I am suggesting that the British Transport Commission as part of their case, have suggested that they are not trying to close the gap; in other words, this is not a deliberate step of part of their policy of abolishing early morning fares altogether. I am pointing out that on the sly, as they will not admit to doing it openly, in fact they are closing the gap. If you accept it that there ought to be fares increases (and, with respect, I would not accept that), I would argue that they should be as little as possible. To that extent I would support Mr. Morrish's proposal.

Finally, in answer to this policy of abolishing early morning returns, I say that it is nonsense to say that everybody should pay the same amount who travels only the same distance, irrespective of the time of day. Here again the practice of the Commission themselves portrays that it is nonsense. They have their ordinary fares, they have their seasons, they have their cheap days, their Forces' tickets and so on. And the London County Council put in their table 106, which illustrates some of these cheap-day facilities. One, I recollect, was during the day at the same date as the early morning return, the same scale, and on some of these cheap fares, of course, they have, as was admitted, first-class facilities at a cheap rate—restaurant cars and so on.

So what it comes to is this: the Commission have singled out the early morning fares for special treatment, and are not doing what they are pretending to do—making the early morning people the same as everyone else, and giving them the same treatment as everyone else.

Now, Sir, if I may deal for one moment with the question of hardship. You were given much evidence on this point on the last occasion, and you were given all the evidence of wages and of London weightings on wages. I, therefore, do not need to cover that ground again. What I do wish to stress is that, of course, life is in many respects particularly expensive in London. There was a

16 April, 1953]

[Continued]

Government Survey based on an inquiry carried out in April, 1947, entitled "The British Household". And that showed that at that time the average London rents were 21s. 1d. a week as compared with the next highest rent, which was 13s. 3d. That makes, on my calculations, London rates slightly more than 58 per cent. higher than the next highest level. Londoners, of course, have to travel further distances than those outside London, and have, for their work, to spend more on fares.

I was, towards the close of the lunch adjournment, giving some figures by the British Transport Commission, which I had asked for from the Bristol Travel Survey. These show how much is spent in Bristol on travel, as compared with London. If you would be good enough to look at Table 17 in the London Travel Survey, the Bristol figures I have I think can be compared with Table 17, bearing in mind that the London Travel Survey was in 1949, and that the Bristol Travel Survey is derived from the level of fares ruling at the early part of 1951. These figures show, first of all, that the average weekly cost of travel by public transport per household in Bristol was as follows: For an income grade of household of £650 per year and over, all journeys 3s. 4d.

(President): All journeys, or all regular journeys?

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): It says all journeys, and regular journeys 2s. 8d. For the income grade of household £8 to £13 a week, all journeys 3s. 10d., regular journeys 3s. 1d.

(Mr. Fay): Would it assist if I handed in two copies of the document from which my learned friend is reading.

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): You will see that up to £8 per week, the figure for all journeys is 3s. 5d., and for regular journeys it is 2s. 8d.; this makes an average of 3s. 6d. and 2s. 9d. The regular journey is defined as a journey for a specific purpose made at least once a week. The average weekly cost of the individual journeys to work by public transport was, in the case of income grade of household £650 a year and over, 3s. 7d. a week; £8 to £13 a week income grade, 3s. 8d. a week, and up to £8 per week income grade, 2s. 9d. per week, making an average of 2s. 10d.

Those figures for travel to and from work—and the other figures—are in excess of the London figures. In addition, of course, in 1951 the London figures will already have gone up further by reason of fares increases.

The position has now been reached, in my submission, when any increase in fares, however small it may be, must cause hardship, either because it means that people will still have to travel, but pay more, and have to do without something else to which they are entitled; or else they will have to give up some travel to which they are entitled.

In particular, of course, the early morning returns, the early morning singles, are an important part of the standard of living and the cost of living of London workers. Not only does one have the increases as they appear from B.T.C. 506, but it must be borne in mind, as appears from the London Travel Survey, Table 14, that many who travel to work have to make two, three, or more breaks in their journey which in many cases—an unknown number of course—will mean that they have to take an additional ticket and therefore have to pay two, three, four, or more increases.

In addition, as has been mentioned before this Tribunal on previous occasions, the principle of workmen's tickets, or early morning cheap tickets, is something for which the Trade Union Movement in London especially has fought for in the past. It is regarded by them as an important matter of principle. I ask this Tribunal not to consider the reduction of early morning tickets, but their extension, to enable clerical workers to take advantage of them. I ask you to bear in mind that this will assist the London Transport themselves by levelling out the heavy peak of traffic at 9 o'clock, and in filling up the valley which occurs between 8 and 9. This, of course, reduces the overheads of the Commission, and therefore is, for them, a double saving.

So far as shift workers' tickets are concerned, I wish to make a special reference. I ask the Tribunal to say categorically that the Transport Commission should continue to issue this type of ticket. You will recollect from last time that about 12,000 of these tickets were issued a day inside London.

(President): You mean that we should do what we did not do last time, and insert a mandatory provision instead?

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): Yes.

(President): Have you any fresh considerations to bring forward?

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): I have. Outside London it was 10,000 a day. The fresh considerations are two in number: first the new hardship that will result if these tickets are abolished. Today a shift worker who does the single distance of three miles, pays 8d.; under the Draft Scheme he will pay 10d., a 25 per cent. increase. At five miles, single journey, today he pays 11d., under the Draft Scheme he will pay 1s. 5d. At eight miles, today he pays 1s. 3d., under the Draft Scheme 2s. 2d. At ten miles, today he pays 1s. 6d., under the Draft Scheme 2s. 8d. At fifteen miles, today he spends 2s. 1d., under the Draft Scheme 4s. And at twenty-five miles, today he pays 2s. 7d., and under the Draft Scheme he has a 100 per cent. increase to 5s. 2d. Those are very substantial increases.

I ask you to bear in mind, Sir, also this: the Government intervened after the finding on the last occasion, and as a result of Government intervention shift workers' tickets are to-day being issued. I say that if the matter was sufficiently important for the Government to intervene, then the Tribunal should not permit the Commission to do away with these tickets, unless there is some new evidence that shift working is no longer of importance, or these tickets are no longer of importance. Of course, the British Transport Commission are not in a position to prove that, because this kind of work is as important as ever. The Commission have given an undertaking—not absolutely, but nevertheless a fairly wide undertaking—that they will not abolish this type of ticket within twelve months from the coming into operation of any Scheme approved by you on this occasion. If the Commission have, at the end of twelve months, good reason for abolishing shift workers' tickets—and I cannot, at the moment envisage such reason, but assuming they have—they can apply to this Tribunal under Section 79 at the end of the year and prove it if they can. This is not a matter that should be left, in my submission, to the mere whim of the Commission.

There is one final type of hardship to which I should like to make particular reference. That is to the aged people, especially those on the old-age pension, which I understand is now 36s. a week. I pointed out the amount of travel which they did for shopping, and the amount of other travel which they did. In my submission, any fares increase must hit these people particularly hard. Nothing which prevents them doing their shopping, visiting their grandchildren, and so on, should be permitted.

(President): You are not suggesting there should be a mandatory provision in the scheme that old-age pensioners should be able to travel at fares less than other people, are you?

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): I think a very strong case could be made out for that.

(President): Are you making out that strong case here?

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): Yes.

(President): Very well; is it in your objection?

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): You asked if I was making out the case now.

(President): If you were not making out the case, then it does not matter what is in your objection; if you are, then it does.

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): It is because it was not in my objection originally that I was not putting it forward formally as a case, but I was asking you to bear this serious matter, in my opinion, in mind when you are considering the hardship involved by these increases.

So far I have sought to show the effect on the public, and on the British Transport Commission's finances, that is on the number of passenger journeys originating, of the increases which they are seeking. The conclusions which I press upon you under this head are that the increases are excessive, unfair, and no answer to the Commission's financial position, assuming they need extra revenue, which I am far from admitting. They fail completely to take account of the effect of the decreasing margin of spending, and of travel trends.

Now may I respectfully suggest the course which the Tribunal ought to take. May I start by a word as to what I conceive to be the correct approach of the Tribunal.

16 April, 1953]

[Continued]

You yourself have said, Sir, that this matter is not to be approached as a running down case, and in my submission the Tribunal ought not, of course, to approach the matter merely as a superior audit board of the accounts or estimates of the Commission.

(President): I do not suppose we could do that, even if we were minded to!

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): What I would like to suggest is that your task is to see that all the provisions of the Act are carried out; that they are carried out by the Commission; that they are carried out equitably; and that they are carried out in the interests of the community. I would stress particularly the duty laid upon the Commission by section 3, sub-section 1 of the Transport Act. You will recollect that they are required by that section to provide or secure or promote the provision of an efficient, adequate, economical and properly integrated system of public inland transport and port facilities within Great Britain for passengers and goods with due regard to safety of operation; and for that purpose it shall be the duty of the Commission to take such steps as they consider necessary for extending and improving the transport and port facilities within Great Britain in such manner as to provide most efficiently and conveniently for the needs of the public, agriculture, commerce and industry".

I ask you to bear in mind section 3, sub-section 4, which provides that the levying of fares and other charges is to be subject to the provisions of this Act, which includes section 3, sub-section 1.

The Tribunal, in my submission, must take into consideration the effect upon the people of London, and of course the people of this country, of any increase in fares. Travel is in the interest of the community and not merely of the traveller. In my submission the engineer, the plumber, the docker, and ourselves I trust, and all who travel, do not thereby gain only for themselves, but are carrying out work and duties which are of importance and benefit to the whole community. In my submission the provisions of the Draft Scheme are such as will not enable the Transport Commission to fulfil their very important duties of providing proper services under the Act.

On those grounds alone I ask you not to approve the Scheme. I ask you not to approve this Scheme in particular until the British Transport Commission take certain steps to rectify the position which they feel they find themselves now in.

I must make it quite clear that I recognise that the Commission are under certain difficulties which are not, of course, of their own making. These difficulties must be recognised. One they make reference to in the very first chapter of their 1951 Report, in which they state: "A major feature of the general economic background of the year was the growing impact of rearmament upon civil capital investment in particular through shortages of labour, steel, and non-ferrous metals. These shortages have particularly handicapped the Commission in their endeavour to provide the facilities which they would wish to offer to passengers and to industry".

I have recognised the difficulties they have in relation to London roads, and that an increase in speed of their road vehicles of one mile an hour would save them in the order of £2m. a year. I recognise that the London Transport Executive pays £725 per year in fuel tax upon every bus. But the Commission is seeking to place all these, and other burdens, directly on the shoulders of the travelling public. They prefer to suggest that the public should smoke less, or drink less, rather than taking certain quite simple steps that are open to themselves.

I ask the Tribunal not to approve any increase in fares till all the questions that I have made reference to have been raised with the Consultative Committee under Section 6 of the Act, also the question of subsequent compensation which amounts to 1s. Id, on every pound taken by the Commission, a "divi", as it were, or rather more than 5 per cent.

(President): I forget what was the ration I imposed at the last hearing of reference to subsequent compensation, it was rather a short one.

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): I have not been long on this occasion.

(President): Take that as being the amber light.

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): Nevertheless, I do say that this matter, which the Prime Minister himself called a millstone round the Commission's neck, is one to which the Commission ought to pay such attention as it open to them under Section 6.

(President): If I had a millstone round my neck, I would certainly pay attention to it.

(Mr. Turner-Samuels): I am asking you to say the same of the Commission, Sir.

I would like—I think I ought—to make it quite clear that I am not attacking the wages of the transport workers, at whose feet the Commission like to put the need for fares increases. Indeed I would not like it to be thought that I was saying that there was not room for more increases; but I do say that any increase in the wages of these workers should not, need not, be found by fares increases.

To conclude, may I say this: the Commission are asking for an increase, heavy though it is on London travellers, of what is to them rather less than 1 per cent. of their gross income. I say that as a matter of accountancy no increase in fares is necessary. Secondly, that the increase in fares demanded is no answer—even assuming the benefit to the Commission for the moment—to the fact that they need an increased yield, because it will not in fact bring a yield. It does not take into account hardship, it does not take into account that they are driving people off their system, and it does not take into account the decreasing margin of spending. Finally it will mean that they are not providing the services for the people of London in accordance with the requirements of the Act.

I say with respect that the Transport Tribunal does not exercise its jurisdiction in a vacuum, it has responsibility for what is a great public service, whose efficiency and adequacy affects the welfare and economy of the whole nation. That fact, and the others I have mentioned to you, should be taken into consideration. I say that there should be no increase in any fares until the British Transport Commission have raised the question with the Consultative Committee, which I have mentioned to you.

Finally, Sir, I ask you to write into any Scheme approved by you a mandatory provision that shift workers' tickets shall be issued.

(President): Who is next?

(Mr. Glover): I think I am next.

(President): Your clients did not put in a Exhibit?

(Mr. Glover): No; there was a question of one document, which I raised in cross-examination, and you did intimate that you did not want it.

(President): I think you did cross-examine Mr. Roberts?

(Mr. Glover): That is the position.

May it please you, Sir, I think this is the first objection dealing with the increase of fares outside London. It is the first to be heard at this inquiry. That being so, I think it is incumbent upon me just to draw your attention to the different bases on which the Commission put their case inside and outside London.

As I understand this matter, the increases inside London are said to be to ensure that London, as a unit, stands on its own feet and pays for the services it uses. That, of course, is an argument we can all understand. I need not say any more about it. But when we look at the basis upon which the Commission have put their case with regard to the increases outside London, we see that it has changed, and the outside London increases, as shown in B.T.C. 4, paragraph 13, represent the charges which can reasonably be asked at this time from the passengers using the services. Reading that, and only taking it so far, it seems that it is a little uncertain exactly what the basis of the case outside London is. Reasonable there could mean reasonable from the point of view of the amount of money the Commission need, or it could mean reasonable from the point of view of the passenger who is to pay it.

I think we can take this a stage further, because my learned friend, Mr. Willis, in opening the case for the Commission—it is on page 27—said that, "From the commercial point of view it is considered that what we are seeking by the Scheme is all that at the present juncture is commercially practicable". That is when he is talking about the Scheme for increased fares outside London.

16 April, 1953]

[Continued]

Now, Sir, that seems to me to put the matter beyond dispute, that the basis is a commercial basis. The Commission is really saying here "commercially we need this money, and commercially it is practical for us to get it in the way that we say".

The first point I mentioned on this, whether it meant reasonable from the point of view of the passenger paying, in my submission rather falls from the basis on which the Commission puts its case. Nevertheless, I feel that representing, as I do, those who are paying the fares, it is not a matter that I can overlook entirely.

Of course it is a hardship, and admittedly, if we are looking at it from a commercial point of view, a hardship case is not the strongest that can be put before you. Here again I would like to paraphrase something that Mr. Willis said in opening with regard to hardship. He said that the Commission should only take notice of and have regard to a hardship case when that hardship meant in fact that the receipts of the Commission would suffer.

A further argument has been used with regard to this matter. It has been said that it is desirable to keep the fares outside London and those inside London on the same scale. I am not quite sure, not having been at the previous inquiry, what that means, whether it means that it is desirable for the Commission, from a purely administrative point of view, in that it is easier for them if all the scales are the same. If that is the case, they have put up, I do not think it is one I can in any way attack at all. Also, Sir, when you come to consider this matter, I do not think it is one that should carry very much weight, unless they go on to say—and as I understand it they have not—that from this ease of administration their revenue is going to be increased. I have not heard any argument to that effect at this inquiry.

If, on the other hand, this desire to keep fares inside and outside London on the same scale arises from what I think Mr. Valentine has described as a social contract between travellers that they should all pay the same, then I am not sure, and my submission to you would be this: this is not a valid argument when considering the traffic outside London.

(Mr. A. E. Sewell): Are you thinking in terms of season ticket rates now?

(Mr. Glover): Yes, Sir. The point, as I understand it, is this: does it matter to the man travelling between, say, Southport and Manchester on a season ticket that he is paying more per mile, or per week, whichever way you look at it, than the man travelling the same distance, or almost the same distance, say, between London and Brighton?

(President): I am not sure what you mean by "does it matter".

(Mr. Glover): Is he really going to say that one season ticket should be related to the cost of the other one?

(President): Do you not think that if all the season ticket holders who travel, say, between Manchester and Southport came aware that they were paying twice as much for the same mileage as someone travelling between Lancaster and Kendal, they would feel some slight sense of surprise?

(Mr. Glover): I think they would, Sir. But then I would not say that was any reason for doubling the cost of the cheaper ticket.

(President): I thought we were concerned on the question of did it matter to the Southport to Manchester man that he was being charged more than the Brighton to London man.

(Mr. Glover): In my submission what matters to him is what he is actually paying, not what somebody else is paying.

(President): If he thinks it matters, if he asks why he should pay more than the man on the Brighton line, one must be able to give him some kind of rational answer. You cannot just say, "We do not like these Southport to Manchester people, and are rather fond of the Brighton traveller". You must give him some explanation. What explanation would you suggest to give to the man who suddenly becomes aware—I forgot the name of the station at Southport—

(Mr. Glover): Chappell Street.

(President): That he is being charged twice as much as the man taking the Brighton line.

(Mr. Glover): If he is aware, the explanation for it ought to be given.

(President): What would be the possible explanation?

(Mr. Glover): I imagine in that case it would be the difference in the cost of running steam trains and electric trains, and matters of that sort. My view of this matter is that the passenger is interested in paying for what he gets, and is not so concerned to equate it with what someone else pays for something quite different, even although it may be over roughly equal mileage.

(President): You mean the man in a hilly district, where a track has been constructed which required a lot of tunnelling or embankments, ought to be well satisfied to be told what the original cost of the line was.

(Mr. Glover): I think, like any other argument, if you take it to extremes, it becomes, in my submission, equally wrong as saying they should all be exactly the same. Of course, there must be some equalisation, and it must depend on lots of other considerations, which I hope to touch on rather later. But the danger here, I would submit, is that the theory will run wild and later we will have to adjust it.

The Commission further says that they need money from the season and the early morning traveller. This seems to be again getting money from those who are not in a position generally to stop travelling. I say again, because it seems to me, having heard the evidence with regard to London, that very much the same is happening there.

Now may I turn to what indications of policy we have had from the Railway Executive at this inquiry. Here again these seem to be a difference between the policy of the Railway Executive and the policy of the London Transport Executive.

(President): Which is the better?

(Mr. Glover): I will say the Railway Executive policy.

(President): That is the one you are concerned with?

(Mr. Glover): Yes, Sir, in a way, Sir; but I hope to enlarge it later.

The Railway Executive policy generally seems to be, "Well, our charges"—I am paraphrasing, I hope fairly accurately—"have, in many cases, reached just about the highest level that we can put them up to. If we put them higher we will lose revenue". So, faced with that situation, they have done what in my submission is the correct thing, they have tried to introduce cheap fares, concessional fares—I think they call them selective reductions in fare rates—to make up any deficit there may be in their revenue. These tickets I am referring to are the cheap day, and the experimental cheap days. There is a further one, that is the London/Edinburgh and the London/Glasgow fares, the cheap fares they have produced, that is another experiment they are trying. With regard to this it is interesting to note that this is a non-intermediate ticket.

(President): You mean the Starlight Special is non-intermediate?

(Mr. Glover): Yes. That, I think, is the one I mean. I was not sure if it was "Starlight" or "Twilight". I tried not to use the word. That is a non-intermediate ticket, that is the ticket that most of the Brighton travellers are using. The ticket which the Commission, to a certain extent, want to get rid of as a sub-standard. I will admit that those two instances are not comparable in every detail. Broadly speaking I would submit they were comparable. And the policy here ought to be the same for both, either you do not have any non-intermediate tickets, or you have non-intermediate tickets for both your ordinary or your privileged travel, and for your season ticket. This is the policy of the Commission. This policy of cheap fares is the one that I think they ought to follow, and the one that, from the evidence, they seem to be following where they want extra revenue. But it falls short of this. They say when they come here, "These experiments are short-lived, they look hopeful, but it is too early for us to say. But we still need an extra half a million pounds from rail travel outside London."

16 April, 1953]

[Continued]

In my submission, a financial case made on that basis cannot really stand up to criticism. The sum they ask for from the traveller outside London, and from two categories of that traveller only, is a small sum, having regard to the total revenue of the Railway Commission. They come and ask for that sum at a time when they have these experiments running, and when they say, from their own evidence, that it is too early to say what result those experiments will have.

For that reason, amongst other things, I ask you to say that no case has been made out, at this inquiry, for a general increase in the season ticket and early morning rates outside London.

Now we come to the rather more particular aspect of my objection. That is the increases on the Brighton line. These increases can be looked at in many ways. You can first say, "Well, it is a small increase, it is only 5s. 3d. a quarter, over what the tickets now cost. (In all these figures I am going to deal with the quarterly season ticket.)" That is one way of looking at it, but in my submission it is a wrong way to look at it, because we have been told quite a number of times that this is a new Scheme. That being so, I think we ought to look at the increases over a period. The figures we have got on these increases were those that I put to Mr. Roberts in cross-examinations. They are as follows. I give them here so that you will have them in one place on the notes. In May, 1940—these are quarterly season tickets—the first class fare between London and Brighton cost £1 0s. 4d. Third class was £10 18s. 1d. In October, 1947, the first class fare was £21 3s. 0d., and the third class was £15 7s. 0d. The existing fare is £22 5s. 9d., first class, and third class, £16 6s. 3d. The proposed fare is, first class, £22 13s. 9d. The third class is £16 11s. 6d., 5s. 3d. up. The maximums, subject to the undertaking, are first, £25 14s. 6d., and third, £17 3s. 0d.

I will leave those figures with you, and let them speak for themselves. If we take a period from May, 1940, to the maximum possible, we get one figure. If we take it in pounds, shillings, and pence, we get one view of that figure. If we take it at the percentage, we get another view. What I do want you to note on those figures is that there is an increase. That is ever upwards ever higher, ever onwards. That may be a good motto for some people to use in this building, but for the Commission I should have thought it was slightly dangerous, to say the least of it.

As I said, the maximum possible is subject to the undertaking. The undertaking I refer to is that given by Mr. Willis on the first day. It appears at page 25 in the transcript. It starts in the middle of the third complete paragraph on the right-hand column of that page:

"The Commission has instructed me to say to the Tribunal that provided the Scheme is approved substantially in the form in which we seek it"—I would like to halt and say that is proviso 1—"and to produce substantially the same revenue as we are asking for"—proviso 2—"they will not vary the sub-standard, ordinary and early morning return fares, and the sub-standard season ticket rates, by more than the same amount as the standard charges of the same value for a period of at least a year from the coming into operation of the new scheme. Subject only to this, it is considered essential to make a reservation that this is assuming that there are no abnormal increases in expenditure of any other sort." Then he goes on to say that there may be Government intervention.

I should very much like to say that that was an undertaking by the Commission that in no event would they put up sub-standard rates by more than they put up the standard rates for a period of one year. I fully appreciate that if I said that the first people to disagree with me would be the Commission itself. I am not trying to say—I hope it is clear that I am not trying to say—that I think there is anything wrong with that undertaking, or that the Commission will not abide by the undertaking as given. That I am not trying to say, because I am sure the undertaking means what it says, and that the Commission will abide by it. It is because the undertaking means what it says that I think we can spend a moment or two finding out what it does mean.

There are three provisos to that. I do not think I need go into them. The first is that the Scheme is substantially approved. The second is that it produces the revenue they

are asking for. As I understand that, that means providing it remains substantially as it is now, and providing our estimates are not wrong; it means if the estimates are wrong they have their way out under this undertaking.

Finally, there is a reservation that this is assuming there are no abnormal increases in expenditure from any other source. There, in my submission, is a crumb of comfort that the passenger having a season ticket can have. But it is nothing more.

That being so, I think that it would be right to regard this Scheme as, if not proposing increases up to the maximum, at least allowing increases up to the maximum, only retained by a very slender thread. I would regard these increases over a period from 1947, and I would say that the increase in the first class quarterly season from that period up to the maximum proposed—which I think we must consider—is £4 11s. 6d. Over the same period the third class quarterly fare has increased by £1 16s.

Apart from the sizes of those increases, there is one other point I should like to make on them. That is, if you look at the figures given you will see that the difference between the cost of the third class quarterly season and the first class quarterly season becomes greater as time goes on.

(President): Which table are we to look at?

(Mr. Glover): There is no table.

(President): There must be a table somewhere.

(Mr. Glover): There has not been a table. These figures were put to Mr. Roberts by me in cross-examination.

(President): Perhaps I have not quite understood what you were telling me. You were telling me the difference between third and first. It rises with the increase of distance.

(Mr. Glover): It rises with the increase of fares. All the figures which I have given you—I am sorry if I have not made it clear—have been London and Brighton, and all quarterly seasons, taking different dates. As you see, the first class fares rise more steeply than the third.

(President): That is all right, is it not.

(Mr. Glover): Well, Sir, it is all right as far as the third-class traveller is concerned; it is not so good as far as the first-class traveller is concerned. In my submission it is not so good as far as the Commission is concerned because the result of that is going to be that the Commission will lose revenue by a greater change from first-class to third-class travel than they would have done if both were going up equally.

(Mr. Sewell): First-class is 50 per cent. more.

(Mr. Glover): Yes, that is a matter that does happen in the way you said; but the result of it in my submission will be that apart from losing traffic in ways I shall mention, you also lose revenue because first-class travellers will travel third-class.

(President): This is really a criticism of the whole Scheme. It has nothing to do with any Brighton point?

(Mr. Glover): No, Sir, except that these are the only figures I have on which to make the point, and when I talk about the effects of the increases on Brighton, that is one of the effects that I want to point out to you.

(President): Have you actually looked at the Draft Scheme?

(Mr. Glover): No, I have not.

(President): I confess I have not looked at it very much lately, though I knew something about the existing Scheme. There is a scale of seasons there. Your point of criticism, valid or invalid, arises because of the scale of seasons. It is not peculiar to Brighton.

(Mr. Glover): No, but then the less you put up a fare the less the differential trend, if I may use that expression.

(President): Of course.

(Mr. Glover): So if you bring it down the difference is going to be less, unless people are going to transfer from first- to third-class. That is all the point I am making.

16 April, 1953]

[Continued]

Sir, if I may consider for a moment where these increases are going to fall and on whom they are going to fall. Here I must once again, because I have only the information for Brighton line, concentrate on that, but it may be that what I shall say will have a wider application. We do know the two classes of fare that are going up outside London are the season ticket and the early morning fare. The travellers in those two classes are, in my submission, people who do not travel for amusement, but people who travel to get to and from their work, or if not to and from their work, at least who travel regularly. That being so, one I think has to look where they travel to and from. In this case we know that 70 per cent. of the season ticket holders travel to London. Taking this point on the Brighton line alone we find that we have the season ticket travellers travelling to London and unless they work very near to Victoria Station, they are going to have to pay any increases in the London fares as well. So their journey to and from work does not consist of one increase but two increases.

These people who are having to pay these two increases are people who are considered, according to the evidence given by the Railway Executive witness, a very important element of the travel, at least on the Brighton line. There again as I said before it just shows that the money is being asked from those who cannot afford it.

If you decide that those are the only people from whom the money can come, and there is need for that money and this Scheme will produce that money, well then, Sir, you must in my submission, do your duty, say these increases as proposed must be put on and hardship must be disregarded. But if you take the point of view that this money—and it is only £3m. outside London—is not necessary, then I think it is a matter that you must consider that it does fall or will fall, if you allow it to go through, on people who cannot with any ease avoid paying it.

Coming to the Brighton line itself, what evidence we have about it is slightly slender, and I make no criticism about this at all. What we are told is all in favour of the line as a commercial undertaking and a commercial proposition. We are told that no figures are known; but here again the policy witness said he would expect it to be paying its way and that he would expect the Brighton season ticket traveller to be paying for the service he was getting.

One might ask at this stage what more can be expected of him. Of course, he has other attributes which in my submission are favourable to the Commission. He pays in advance for travel he uses. Although I do not put any store by the amount of interest the Railway Executive could earn on the money that they are paid in advance, it is something which is preferable to the man paying just as he takes his journey, to put it no higher; further, he pays for his travel whether he takes it or not. I admit this point is quite open to the criticism: Yes, but he could travel backwards and forwards all day if he wanted to do so, or he could be paying for less travel than he is taking. Of course, that is true, but in my submission the average man will travel once a day each way, probably five times a week, and there will be certain times when he does not travel when he takes a couple of days off or something like that, that will not be made up by his over-travelling on the days when he is travelling.

There is another thing with regard to this Brighton line. The service provided—and here I am very pleased to give the Railway Executive another humble pat on the back—is a very good one. It is a fast service, the train taking roughly an hour, maybe a little under or a little over, for a journey of 51 miles. It is an hourly service. It is made up of very fast non-stopping trains and also trains which are fast trains, but do occasionally stop. It also has trains which, although they move quickly between stations, stop rather a lot. Every service you might want is there, but the particular service the season ticket holder wants is the fast non-stop service. It is the provision of that service which has allowed Brighton to become a dormitory town and to give the help it does give in the dispersal of population from London, with the benefits that help brings to London itself.

It is that fast train that the season ticket holder wants. It is for that train that his non-intermediate season ticket

is issued. In my submission that is of benefit both to the Commission and to the traveller, and that non-intermediate season ticket is one that should be kept. It should not be allowed to be brushed aside in this desire for standardisation in all things.

Let me come to the effects of these increases. The figures as given in B.T.C. 601 show an estimated drop in season tickets between 1952, the existing charges, and "Y" year at existing charges, of 2,34m. journeys. That is the general picture, and the Brighton picture we do not know over quite the same periods, but we do know we have figures for the number of season tickets issued in 1951 and the number in 1952. Here again I have not a table, but these figures were put to Mr. Roberts. The estimated number of season ticket holders in 1951 was 4,530, and in 1952 it was 4,069. That is a drop of something just over 400 in a total of 4,500; it is about one-tenth in those two years. I will come later on to the reasons there, but it is certainly a larger trend than is shown in B.T.C. 601, and it is certainly much larger than the discount for loss of traffic shown in column 5 of B.T.C. 602.

(Mr. Poole): Are those comparisons 1950-51 or 1951-52?

(Mr. Glover): The comparisons, I am afraid, are not strictly accurate. The Brighton figures are 1951-52; the other figures are 1952-¹ "Y" year.

(Mr. Poole): I meant for Brighton.

(Mr. Glover): The other figures are 1952-¹ "Y" year.

(Mr. Poole): Yes, I appreciate that.

(Mr. Glover): In my submission the reason for those differences, although the proportions are not right, because they are not between the same years—but I think they would be roughly the same if we could project this figure to "Y" year—the reasons for the proportion drop is because of the particular characteristics of Brighton. Brighton is a dormitory town for London. It is 51 miles from London, and it is about as far from London as a dormitory town can conveniently be. As I say, it is only because of this good service provided by the Railway Executive that it can be so used as a dormitory town. This being so, the fares there to that town are high in comparison with the fares of those travelling to London from nearer. Therefore, they represent a higher part of a man's expenditure before he starts than does the season ticket from nearer London. Therefore any increase of these season tickets means that more people are going to move in where they can save themselves quite a lot of money. The loss of traffic, in my submission, is going to be greater at the end of what I might call the dormitory town area than it is in the middle. That, in my submission, is why you see that the drop figures in Brighton are proportionately higher than the drop figures estimated by the Commission. In my submission the same thing will happen in "Y" year.

(President): Mr. Glover, Are you seriously asking us to hold as a fact that Brighton is being depopulated in some measure by the increase in season ticket rates?

(Mr. Glover): I will come on to that later, if I may. If you would like it now, I am quite willing, of course, to give it to you.

(President): No, we would prefer to have it in your order.

(Mr. Fay): I am sure my friend does not wish to mislead the Tribunal, and I am sure, if he remembered, he would remind you that Mr. Roberts gave an explanation.

(Mr. Glover): I am much obliged to my learned friend. He said it was to a certain extent due to the early morning tickets.

(President): He gave three reasons. The question is on page 283. He did not accept your invitation to agree that the drop in the issue of season tickets was connected with the last increase in the charges.

(Mr. Glover): Not wholly, I think he said. He said the drop of traffic—

(President): Wait a minute. Your question was: "So that on your last charges increase there was a drop of something like 1,000 season tickets issued". The answer was: "No, I think it is a mistake to attribute the drop to the last charges increase". Then he gives three reasons why he thinks it is a mistake.

16 April, 1953]

[Continued]

(*Mr. Glover*): But the second one is not to be taken into account in answering that particular question, because I am dealing with both first and third class tickets there. Then he says the early morning returns—

(*Mr. Fay*): "Largely due to".

(*Mr. Glover*): Yes, largely due to the early morning returns. I am much obliged. I would still submit that the decrease in longer areas is going to be greater than the decrease in the shorter journeys.

(*President*): I think that is probably sound in principle; I do not know how important it is. Other things being equal, a man who has to find £10 extra would be more likely to change his abode than if the increase that is going to fall on him is only 6d. That is the principle you are contending for, is it not?

(*Mr. Glover*): Yes, and add to that the fact that from the outside journeys he has to pay an inside increase as well.

(*President*): Of course, that extra fare, when he gets to London, will be equally payable by the short journey man as well as by the long journey man.

(*Mr. Glover*): Yes. May I draw your attention to Exhibit B.T.C. 602? I am sure you have the figures in your mind, but it is in line 6, column 5, that the discount for loss of traffic is shown. That figure, as I understand it, is one that is founded on the Railway Executive's experience of what is likely to happen all over the country. In cross-examination I did ask if any attempt had been made to see at what distances this drop would come. I was told it was not done that way, and I can fully appreciate that it was not done that way. Really I suppose there is no reason why it should be. This as an overall figure will probably be very accurate, and I do not wish to quarrel with it as an overall figure, but I do wish to submit that it cannot be applied as a percentage to Brighton, and that one cannot say that is your drop in travellers there.

(*Mr. Poole*): This figure is really Nil, is it not? It is merely rounded off. If it had been 200 originally, they would have put it in at 200 again.

(*Mr. Glover*): As I was saying, in this case also the difference between first and third class increasing as the price of ticket increases on the longer journeys, the attraction of travelling third class is going to become greater than it was; therefore there is going to be a certain loss of revenue again, because people faced with an increase which they find difficult to pay are going to say: "I can save money by travelling third whereas I travelled first".

(*President*): Not because the new third class coaches are much more comfortable than the old first?

(*Mr. Glover*): That may have something to do with it, but I am instructed that these trains are very full, and one is lucky if one can get in such a carriage. However, those are two reasons why the Commission are going to lose money over an increase in Brighton's fare. It may not offset—and I do not suggest it will—all the increased revenue they will get from the increased fare, but I think we have a figure for that: it is taken on quarterly tickets, and it is one guinea times 4.069. I am not suggesting that the loss they are going to make is going to equal the extra revenue they are going to get, but I am submitting that it is going to bite into it very deeply. The increase on this line is not going to show the full yield that the Railway Executive expect from it.

(*President*): We cannot have a separate Charges Scheme for Brighton.

(*Mr. Glover*): That is one of the difficulties I fully appreciate, but I do feel that if the Commission are seeking to put up all their season tickets they must show that there is a need to put them all up, and may be if you are satisfied on that, you will say: "Well then, we are satisfied they must all go up; they must all go up irrespective of the hardship that is going to be incurred in certain places". If there is a doubt in your mind I can only instance what I submit will happen at Brighton and submit that that will happen round the whole of the outer ring of what I call the London dormitory area and the other towns which are dormitory areas. Therefore, it will weigh in your mind when considering the

commercial advisability of putting up season tickets. That is the first way in which I put it.

The second way in which I put it is in view of the evidence we have about the traffic on the Brighton line, and in view of the facts that we are told that it is paying its own way, you should in your confirmation of this Scheme say at least that the non-intermediate season ticket on this line should be kept. I admit that is asking you to give the Commission a mandatory injunction, but I would submit that is not the same thing as telling the Commission that they do not know how to run their services. It is saying that they will carry that burden in the rightful interests of those who travel on that particular line.

May I now come to what you have called the depopulation point. This is not a point on which I lay any great emphasis, because it is a matter which must of necessity extend over a very considerable period of time before it will have any effect, but I do say that it is wrong now to start this trend or to start what might be a trend away from Brighton. The reasons for which I say there will be such a trend are as follows: The Brighton traveller has to travel 51 miles to work. If he does not travel by train he has for practical purposes no alternative means of transport, all other means of transport going through London at any rate, until we have a helicopter service, are going to be so slow from the outskirts of London as to be an impracticable proposition; therefore, in so far as the increases are such that any traveller says he cannot pay them or he will not pay them, he must move nearer his work which in most cases is nearer London.

That being so, the effect of that on Brighton is going to be that a certain amount of population—but it is not the amount with which I bother; it is the trend—is going to move out of Brighton. That may be filled up for a certain time by people who want to come into Brighton and who have a chance to do it owing to these people going out, but as prices go up, if they do go up, the people coming in are going to be less than those going out. I must admit that the numbers are so small as not to have any effect or any appreciable effect on Brighton for very many years, but the trend is going to be started, and we do know about towns that they are rather like people: if they are not going forward they are going back, and once a trend of that sort has started it is going to be very difficult to stop it.

(*President*): I want to treat this argument with all becoming seriousness, but are you really suggesting that to ask a man to pay another 5d. a week will drive him from Brighton to some nearer suburb of London?

(*Mr. Glover*): For the purpose of this argument I am looking at the increase that he will have to bear when the undertaking runs out. The figures of increase up till the end of the undertaking, assuming for the moment that the Scheme is confirmed as in Draft 9, are small, and that small increase will probably not have this effect at all; the larger one might. It is only because this trend is one that must be guarded against that Brighton feels it should be brought to your attention. We may be, and I sincerely hope we are, making more of it than in actual fact will be the case. I would ask you to put it in the scale in this way: It will be just one of the other points that you will weigh if you decide as I would ask you to decide, that no commercial case, or a very, very weak commercial case has been made out for the increase of season tickets anywhere.

You will therefore consider the incidence I have given you on Brighton, and if you decide there is anything in it, you will say that that is a reason why the British Transport Commission ought to forego in the interests of this community and other communities like it so much of its increased revenue which it might possibly get from the Scheme. If, of course, you decide that this increase is necessary and that this Scheme will get the money, and that it must as a commercial Scheme go forward, then of course you will disregard the point I am making. I cannot put it higher than that, and I do not want to labour it. I think you have the point I am making, but may I just say in closing this point that if this depopulation, if I may use that word of such a slow trend, does take place, then the effects are not only on Brighton but on

16 April, 1953]

[Continued]

the Commission, and they are going to be serious. The Brighton line, we are told, caters for considerable traffic, an hourly service, and it fills the trains. It is probable that it is paying for the service that is given. I say that because I think those are the words, or at least the sense of the words, used in evidence by Mr. Roberts.

If we get this depopulation, the attractions of Brighton will go to a certain extent, as the rateable value falls. The holiday crowds will become less, and the Commission's receipts will become less. The matter is such a long-term trend and it is really in a way, we hope, speculative, but it is something which we do feel ought to be considered if this matter comes into consideration at all. I do not want to say any more about it. I am quite certain you have my point. There it is.

To finish with, may I give you my submissions? My first submission is that no case has been made out by the Commission at this Inquiry for the necessity of an increase in the season ticket and early morning fares outside London.

Second, Sir, such increases should wait until the full effects of the experiments, if I may use that word, which the Railway Executive are making with regard to cheap day fares and concessionary fares, are known.

Third, if you consider that some case has been made out for some increase looking at the thing commercially, you should have regard to some of the factors I have mentioned and decide whether, although extra money is needed by the Commission, the Commission should bear that loss or not in the interests of the travelling public. In my submission, you should answer the last question by saying that the Commission should bear that loss and there should be no increase in fares.

(President): Who is next in order?

(Mrs. Hunt): I believe I am next. I represent the London Area Committee of the Association of Scientific Workers.

When the London Area Committee of the Association of Scientific Workers submitted to its London members the terms of the objection to be lodged at the Transport Tribunal to these proposed increases in fares, one member suggested ironically that the objection should be copied in sufficient quantity to be used again at what he called "next year's Tribunal and the ones after that". This comment indicates just how the present position appears to the workers of London, namely, that these applications to increase fares are becoming an annual event.

When the last Tribunal was held a Statement was made by myself on behalf of this Association and that statement is just as valid today as it was then. I said on that occasion that scientific workers, by virtue of the specialist nature of their employment, frequently had to travel a great deal further than many other sections of workers, and therefore had to pay more fares; that many of them required to attend classes, in order to improve their qualifications involved further expenditure on fares; and that scientific workers in general are not well paid.

I do not propose, unless the Tribunal so desires, to repeat the whole of what I said on that occasion, but I would like respectfully to suggest that the Tribunal re-reads that statement which appears on page 629 of the Minutes of Evidence in Application 498, 1951. I have one or two points to add to the evidence given in that statement.

Further examples collected by this Association confirm the points made eighteen months ago. We have examples of people spending up to 31s. 3d. a week to get to work, not because they live in outlandish places, but because their specialist work limits their possibility of employment. We have obtained information from a group of our members, laboratory technicians, who all work at the same place. Their salaries range from 62s. 6d. at age 16, to a maximum of 165s. for males and 144s. for females at age 26. In order to obtain an extra 10s. a week on these scales it is necessary for them to pass certain examinations, and therefore many of the younger workers attend classes.

Sixteen out of 31 members from whom we obtained information spend 10s. a week or more on fares to and

from work alone, and a further 6 spend 8s. or 9s. Eighteen out of 31 also go to classes, which means that they spend various additional sums on fares for these classes.

I quote the information regarding this group of members because we believe it to be typical of numbers of our members living in the London area. The firm where these people work is one where this Association has been able to negotiate salary scales, and conditions there are likely to be better than in places where we have been unable so to do.

Many scientists and technicians are not paid for working overtime and those for whom overtime is paid do not in general have the same opportunities for supplementing their basic salaries, because the work does not exist. Piece-work is practically unknown among scientific workers, therefore their basic rate tends to represent their actual earnings. The London differentials paid to some classes of our members are not sufficient to cover the higher rents and costs of many commodities in London as well as the higher cost of travel. For example, in the engineering industry the difference between London and the provincial rates for technicians is only 5s. a week. For laboratory technicians in Universities in London weighting is recommended of £10 a year at 20 years of age and under; £20 from 21 to 25 years of age; and £30 at 26 years of age and over.

The policy of wage restraint which has in general restricted wage and salary increases to the lower paid workers has meant that the standard of living of scientists and technicians has fallen relatively more than has that of these lower paid workers. The Trade Union movement believes that the differences between skilled and unskilled workers should be maintained and that while every unskilled worker is entitled to an adequate standard of living, skill and ability should be further rewarded. We believe that the value of the scientist and technician to the community is not adequately recognised in the salaries received and that the imposition of additional expenditure on fares will further worsen the standards of this section of the community. Because the financial rewards are inadequate, and out-of-pocket expenses such as fares are higher than in other occupations, young people will be discouraged from entering scientific employment and a dearth of scientists and technicians may well result.

There are some points which my Association respectfully ask the Tribunal to take into consideration in giving its judgment. As scientific workers we are particularly concerned that the fullest possible use should be made of scientific methods of man-power in order to increase efficiency of transport and to reduce running costs. Research has already shown that various measures, if carried out, would result in a saving of time and money. It has been stated that London Transport could save £2m. annually if the average speed of London buses was increased by 1 mile per hour. The Report of the London and Home Counties Traffic Advisory Committee of 1951 states the cost of traffic congestion, in lost man-hours and vehicle-hours, must amount to many millions of pounds per annum. On an average busy day in Central London the buses lose 800 scheduled miles owing to traffic congestion. The same Report states there has been no major speed improvement in inner London since 1905, when Kingsway and Aldwych were completed.

Now it has been suggested that London travellers cannot be subsidised at the expense of others. I submit that London travellers are already in a sense subsidising other people. In a lecture delivered on the 8th May, 1952, by Mr. C. T. Brunner, President of the Institute of Transport, it was estimated that out of a total annual expenditure on motor vehicle operation in Great Britain in 1951 of £1,400m., £226m. or approximately 16 per cent. went on taxation. That is licences and fuel tax. The amount derived from motor taxation in that period was £240m. and of that sum only one-eighth, £30m., was allocated to the roads.

I have not been able to obtain similar figures for London alone, but it is deducible from the national figures that about 13 per cent. of what the Londoner spends on fares goes on purposes quite unconnected with transport. In fact it goes to save other taxpayers' money. I would like to ask the Commission to make the strongest possible representations about these facts to the Government and

16 April, 1953]

[Continued]

I suggest that the Commission might ask for some concessions. After all, one has already been awarded in the Budget to London taxi owners.

In conclusion, I would like to say that the provision of transport for London workers should not be regarded as an exercise in bookkeeping. A point will be reached where the fall in travel will more than counter-balance the increase in revenue from higher fares. I do not pretend to estimate where and when that point will be reached, but I do say, on behalf of my members, that rationing by purse is not a method that should be applied to such essential a commodity as public transport.

(*Mr. Turner-Samuels*): May I ask before you rise a question in relation to the prospective L.T.C. 2? May I now put in the original document with a change in three figures. The first three in column 12 should read 75 per cent., 125 per cent., and 120 per cent., respectively. I have taken the necessary steps with your staff, and with your permission—

(*President*): Are those figures now agreed?

(*Mr. Fay*): Those are the figures which I suggested are the right ones.

(*President*): Very well, it can go in.

(*Adjourned until tomorrow morning at 10.30 o'clock.*)

16 April, 1953]

[Continued]

INCREASES IN WORKMEN'S FARES AND EARLY MORNING RETURN FARES

L.T.C. 2

Miles (Single Journey Distance)	Pre-War			1950			1950 Scheme	1952 Scheme	1953 Draft Scheme	Increase in 1953 Draft Scheme over L.T. Rail since:—		
	L.T.E.		R.E.	L.T.E.		R.E.	(E.M.R.)	(E.M.R.)	(E.M.R.)	Pre- War	1950	
	Road (exclud- ing coaches)	(*) Rail		Road (exclud- ing coaches)	(a) (5)		(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
(1)	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	per cent.	per cent.
1	—	—	2	—	3	3	4	4½	5	6	7	133 75
2	2	3	3	3	4	4 (c)	4	6	8	9	200	125
3	3 (b)	3	4	4	5½	5	8½	7	9	11	175	120
4	4	4	5½	5	6	9½	8	11	10	11	140	100
5	5 (b)	5	6	6 (c)	6	11	10	10	10	10	133	100
6	6	6	7	7	7	11	10	10	10	10	128	100
7	7 (d)	7	7½	8 (d)	8	11½	11	12	12	12	112	88
8	8	8	8½	9	9	1 1	1 0	1 3	1 3	1 3	111	90
9	9	9	9	10	10	1 1	1 1	1 5	1 5	1 5	100	81
10	10	10	10	11	11	1 3½	1 3	1 6	1 8	1 8	100	81

(a) Mainly confined to trams and trolley-buses. Workmen's fares do not apply on L.T.E. buses (with minor exceptions).

(b) No 3d. and 5d. Workmen's fares on ex-L.C.C. tram system—4d. and 6d. fares applied at these distances.

(c) No 4d. and 6d. Workmen's fares on ex-L.C.C. tram system—5d. and 7d. fares applied at these distances.

(d) Maximum Workmen's fare on ex-L.C.C. tram system, regardless of distance.

(*) Other than Metropolitan Line. The scale shown in Column (4) for R.E. applied on the Metropolitan Line.

N.B.—Columns 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 together with the Notes thereto are abstracted from Exhibit AV/5.

CORRIGENDA

SIXTH DAY—THURSDAY, 12TH MARCH, 1953.

Page 84, Question 993, line 5—for "trng" read "trying".

Page 93, Question 1204, line 4—delete "of".

ELEVENTH DAY—MONDAY, 23RD MARCH, 1953.

Page 194, Question 3014, Penultimate line—for "Gas-works Junction" read "Gas-factory Junction".

Page 195, Question 3054, line 8—for "Hazelmere" read "Haslemere".

TWELFTH DAY—TUESDAY, 24TH MARCH, 1953.

Page 221, Question 3456, line 4—for "£900,00" read "£900,000".

Page 232, Question 3745, line 1—after "at the" amend to read "ordinary, monthly, day".

Page 232, Question 3751, line 3—for "2.48" read "2.44".

Page 232, Question 3755, line 2—for "2.48" read "2.44".

THIRTEENTH DAY—WEDNESDAY, 25TH MARCH, 1953.

Page 252, Question 4008, line 3—for "three of four" read "three or four"

Page 256, Question 4097, line 2—for "millioneth" read "millionth".

FOURTEENTH DAY—THURSDAY, 26TH MARCH, 1953.

Page 279, Question 4519, line 4—for "rates" read "revenue".

FIFTEENTH DAY—TUESDAY, 31ST MARCH, 1953.

Page 298, Question 4965, line 7—insert "experimental" before "cheap-day".

Page 310, Question 5180, line 3—for "No" read "Yes".

SIXTEENTH DAY—WEDNESDAY, 1ST APRIL, 1953.

Page 316, Question 5211—amend to read "If it fails to spend all that, the standard maintenance charge, it is debited with the difference, which is credited in turn to the abnormal maintenance account".

Page 316, Question 5215, line 1—for "for" read "from".

Page 328, Question 5502, line 1—for "£3.2m." read "£32m."

Page 331, Question 5568, column 2, line 12—for "35 per cent." read "25 per cent."